

REGULAR WEEKLY SESSION-----ROANOKE CITY COUNCIL

July 21, 2003

2:00 p.m.

The Council of the City of Roanoke met in regular session on Monday, July 21, 2003, at 2:00 p.m., the regular meeting hour, in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, pursuant to Chapter 2, Administration, Article II, City Council, Section 2-15, Rules of Procedure, Rule 1, Regular Meetings, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended.

PRESENT: Council Members C. Nelson Harris, Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch (left the meeting prior to adjournment), M. Rupert Cutler, Alfred T. Dowe, Jr., and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----6.

ABSENT: Council Member Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr. -----1.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The meeting was opened with a prayer by The Reverend J. Donald Earwood, Associate Pastor, Villa Heights Baptist Church.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

PRESENTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

DECEASED PERSONS: Mr. Cutler offered the following resolution expressing sympathy upon the passing of the late Clare White:

(#36429-072103) A RESOLUTION memorializing the late Clare Stone White, a native of Roanoke and a retired editor and features writer for *The Roanoke Times*.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 97, page 506.)

2

Mr. Cutler moved the adoption of Resolution No. 36429-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler, Dowe, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Fitzpatrick was absent.)

ACTS OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT-GREENWAY SYSTEM-SCHOOLS: Alan G. Soltis, Vice President, Lanford Brothers Contractors, and Past President, Virginia Road and Transportation Builders Association (VRTBA), addressed Council on behalf of local members of the organization. He called attention to a partnership that was formed approximately two years ago with the Roanoke City Schools, Roanoke County Schools, Botetourt County Schools and the Salem School District to achieve the following goals: to reinforce with students the importance of maximizing the opportunity to receive a quality education in the Roanoke Valley's school system by demonstrating practical ways in which the curriculum can provide a better opportunity to be successful in their life long profession; to present opportunities available in the construction industry for both those who will attend college to become engineers, bookkeepers and business persons, as well as those who will enter the job market directly out of high school; and to instill the importance of becoming good corporate citizens upon graduation by joining the work force and giving something back to the communities in which they live and work. He stated that due to a team effort by many persons in the Roanoke Valley, the above stated goals have been achieved.

Mr. Soltis advised that in 2002, through the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership program, a \$4,500.00 grant was approved for the Raleigh Court Civic League to complete a portion of the Murray Run Greenway project, which extends behind Patrick Henry High School. He explained that initial quotes received by the Raleigh Court Civic League for the project was in the range of \$17,000.00, which was considerably higher than the budget; however, VRTBA saw the project as an opportunity to not only teach students the importance of the greenway system in the Roanoke Valley, but to demonstrate how private companies can help their communities. He advised that local members of the Virginia Road Builders Association agreed to construct the project for the \$4,500.00 grant and donated all materials and labor; working in conjunction with the Roanoke Valley Greenway

Commission and City's Parks and Recreation Department, additional funding was identified for plantings and a new wooden guardrail which acted as an enhancement to the project; and it is estimated that a \$4,500.00 grant was turned into a \$25,000.00 plus benefit for the community. He stated that since the project is located behind Patrick Henry High School, students learned about the greenway system and how the design and construction of a transportation system comes together, and students in the applied construction group assisted with actual construction.

Mr. Soltis advised that the success of the Partners In Education program is due, in large measure, to the Roanoke Valley School System, the City's Department of Parks and Recreation, the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission, civic leagues, businesses and government leaders working together in an effort to make their community the very best it can be. Therefore, on behalf of the Virginia Road and Transportation Builders Association, he presented the City of Roanoke with a symbolic acrylic dump truck with the following inscription: "The City of Roanoke, a Virginia Road and Transportation Builder Partner in Education — Building the Future Through the Youth of Today, 2002-2003."

CONSENT AGENDA

The Mayor advised that all matters listed under the Consent Agenda were considered to be routine by the Members of Council and would be enacted by one motion in the form, or forms, listed on the Consent Agenda and if discussion was desired, that item would be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately. He called specific attention to two closed sessions to discuss vacancies on boards and commissions and terms of a contract in negotiation.

COMMITTEES-CITY COUNCIL: A communication from Mayor Ralph K. Smith requesting that Council convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss vacancies on certain authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by Council, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Harris moved that Council concur in the request of the Mayor to convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss vacancies on various authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by the Council, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

4

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler Dowe, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Fitzpatrick was absent.)

ANNUAL REPORTS-COMMITTEES-REAL ESTATE VALUATION: A communication from Mayor Ralph K. Smith transmitting the 2003 Annual Report of the Board of Equalization, was before Council.

Mr. Harris moved that the communication and report be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Fitzpatrick was absent.)

CITY MANAGER-CITY COUNCIL: A communication from the City Manager requesting that Council convene in a Closed meeting to discuss terms of a contract in negotiation, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(30), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Harris moved that Council concur in the request of the City Manager to convene in a Closed Meeting as above described. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler Dowe, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Fitzpatrick was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-COMMUNITY PLANNING-ROANOKE ARTS COMMISSION-COURT COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BOARD-FIFTH PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION: The following reports of qualification were before Council.

Clifford R. Weckstein as a member of the Court Community Corrections Program Regional Community Criminal Justice Board, for a term ending June 30, 2005;

Darlene L. Burcham as a member of the Roanoke Valley Alleghany Regional Commission, for a term ending June 30, 2006;

Paula L. Prince as a member of the City Planning Commission, for a term ending December 31, 2004; and

William B. Hopkins, Jr., to fill the unexpired term of Robert Humphreys, resigned, ending June 30, 2004; and George Kegley and Charles E. Jordan for terms ending June 30, 2004, as members of the Roanoke Arts Commission

Mr. Harris moved that the reports of qualification be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler Dowe, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Fitzpatrick was absent.)

REGULAR AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARINGS: NONE.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

ARMORY/STADIUM: Brian J. Wishneff, representing Citizens for a Sensible Stadium Decision, appeared before Council in support of renovating Victory Stadium; and advised that because Victory Stadium was constructed in 1942 does not mean that the facility has out lived its useful life when many other great stadiums in the United States were constructed prior to Victory Stadium.

6

In delivering his presentation, Mr. Wishneff reviewed various documents that are on file in the City Clerk's Office; i.e.: a stadium comparison of the new Victory Stadium/Amphitheater and a renovated Victory Stadium; excerpts from consultants reports by Cellar Door Promotions, C. H. Johnson Consulting, and International Sports Properties; a Chronology of Studies and Cost Estimates from January 1996 - August 2000; a document entitled, "Stadium/Amphitheater: an Evaluation Process," prepared by Barry L. Marsh, Architect and Certified Value Specialist; a Victory Stadium Renovation/Replacement Study (Budget Analysis), prepared by Rosser International; copy of an e-mail from Michael Pulice, Architectural Historian, Roanoke Regional Preservation Office, Virginia Department of Historic Resources, with regard to the possibility of historic status for Victory Stadium; Project Costs for Victory Stadium with State and Federal Historic Tax Credits; copy of an e-mail from Dr. E. Wayne Harris, Superintendent of Schools, with regard to the Schools' Transportation operation; New Stadium Operating Budget Comparisons; Annual Economic Comparison of Victory Stadium to the Proposed Stadium/Amphitheater; copy of an e-mail from the City's Utilities Engineer with regard to the Flood Reduction Project; copy of an e-mail from the City Engineer with regard to funding for the Roanoke River Flood Reduction Project; Section 36.1-429, Code of the City of Roanoke, (1979), as amended, with regard to seating for spectator purposes; remarks of former Council Member William H. Carder before the Board of Zoning Appeals with regard to lights from the field at Hidden Valley Intermediate School; a quote from Eric Earnhardt as contained an article in *The Roanoke Times*, on behalf of Carilion Roanoke Memorial Hospital, with regard to Carilion's new parking garage next to Victory Stadium; remarks of Council Member William D. Bestpitch at the October 15, 2002 Council meeting with regard to the importance of preservation; and a document with regard to amphitheaters, four main reasons why multi-use facilities do not work.

Mr. Mark Hurley, 1018 Howbert Avenue, S. W., advised that Victory Stadium has been discussed in various formats since 1995, and in 2001, Council proclaimed that it had finally made a decision regarding the facility and it was time to move forward. He expressed concern that when old issues are revisited, old wounds in the City of Roanoke are reopened, therefore, Council should move forward with the decision that was made in 2001. He stated that Council's vote was 6 - 0 to construct a new stadium in 2001; in an effort to think "outside of the box", Mr. Wishneff is trying to make the point that multi-purpose complexes are being abandoned by communities such as Cincinnati, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh; and such facilities are referred to as "cookie cutter" stadiums which were built in the 1970's as dual facilities for professional football and baseball and used for a short time. He stated that teams are abandoning these types of stadiums, not because of their use, but because they make more money by constructing their own stadiums. He referred

to Mr. Wishneff's remarks regarding football stadiums that were constructed prior to Victory Stadium, and pointed out that those stadiums have been constantly renovated, while nothing has been done to Victory Stadium in approximately 60 years; and upon renovating, the City will probably discover that renovation costs will be much higher. He advised that the question before Council is: Victory Stadium can be renovated, but 15 years from now, will Victory Stadium be the quality of stadium that represents the citizens of Roanoke and those high school students who play sports in the facility? He stated that Roanoke's students do not deserve a mediocre, or just adequate facility, they deserve a standard of quality. He advised that Council has made good and sound decisions about the forward progress of the City; although it has been difficult at times, Council has already made the right decision regarding the Victory Stadium issue; all of the facts have been reviewed; there may be problems to overcome with the proposed new stadium/amphitheater, such as parking, neighborhood issues, lights, etc., but in making its decision, Council and City staff are committed to ensuring that the new facility will work.

Mr. Chris Craft, 1501 East Gate Avenue, N. E., spoke against a new stadium/amphitheater on Orange Avenue due to traffic concerns which have not been adequately addressed; and the City of Roanoke currently has a quality stadium that can be renovated. He stated that the question should be decided by the voters of Roanoke through a referendum.

Ms. Helen E. Davis, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., advised that the City of Roanoke has a history of destroying its historical buildings and historical sites, which must stop; and asked that Council reconsider its decision to move forward with the Orange Avenue stadium/amphitheater complex. She referred to petitions signed by citizens from all quadrants of the City who favor the renovation of Victory Stadium because of its historical value. She stated that residents of Gainsboro do not want the stadium/amphitheater to be constructed in their neighborhood because it is the wrong location for an amphitheater, which facilities are typically constructed in a quiet and serene location without all of the traffic concerns that the Orange Avenue site will raise.

Mr. Tom Link, 2201 Carolina Avenue, S. W., addressed the vision for the future of Victory Stadium and the City's duty to honor the deed of 1941 with Norfolk and Western Railway (NS) which requires that the City maintain Victory Stadium. He advised that in the 1970's, the City of Indianapolis made a decision to pursue the sports market; by 1998, there was a \$1.13 billion impact on the City of Indianapolis, with eight governing bodies of sports headquartered in the City, 17 new sites have been added through either renovation or new construction, \$400 million has been generated in building construction, with over \$700 million added in payrolls, or

8

about \$35 million a year. In summary, he stated that the City of Indianapolis made visionary decisions to strive for a certain goal; and the City of Roanoke has the same vision and possibilities with Victory Stadium and the sports complex that currently surrounds Victory Stadium. Secondly, he referred to the City of Charlottesville, the home of Scott Stadium, and advised that in 1962, Scott Stadium held less than 10,000 people, while today, the facility is a 60,000 seat venue, which did not happen by accident, but by design. He stated that Victory Stadium has unused space under the grandstands consisting of 170,000 square feet that could be developed; and if one takes out 50,000 square feet for locker rooms and concessions and another 20,000 square feet for storage, etc., 100,000 square feet could be turned into office space at \$10.00 per square foot, therefore, \$1 million per year would be generated from the facility. He referred to the agreement with the Norfolk and Western Railway, through the Virginia Holding Corporation, that the City would maintain Victory Stadium; however, over the years, the City has not honored its pledge. He inquired if Victory Stadium has ever been properly marketed as a complex. For the above reasons, he advised that Council should reconsider its vote, because there is a tremendous investment in Victory Stadium and it is a question of capitalizing on what the City already has and determining what it can be in the future.

Council Member Bestpitch and Mr. Wishneff engaged in dialogue regarding the maximum dollar amount proposed by Mr. Wishneff to renovate Victory Stadium; whereupon, Mr. Wishneff responded in the range of \$10 million, along with construction of a separate stand alone amphitheater.

Council Member Cutler referred to a conversation with a promoter who has been instrumental in bringing big time entertainment to Roanoke for the past 15 years who states that he does not use Victory Stadium because it is too risky in terms of problems with inclement weather and drainage, and he is reluctant to hold concerts in such close proximity to a hospital. He advised that the proposed new facility on Orange Avenue will bring versatility by meeting multiple needs; it will provide a good facility for markets the size of Roanoke's that cannot justify a stand alone arena like the Nisson Center in northern Virginia; and just as the Roanoke Civic Center has successfully accommodated hockey and basketball, the new facility will successfully accommodate up to 10,000 sports fans for games and up to 18,000 spectators for musical and other kinds of amphitheater based entertainment.

Council Member Wyatt called attention to the number of occasions that the Victory Stadium issue has been discussed by the Council in open forums where citizens have had the opportunity to voice their concerns. She expressed concern that by continuing to debate the issue, a message is being sent to Roanoke's young people that the memories of Roanoke's are more important than the future of Roanoke's youth. She stated that Roanoke's express concerns about their young people moving to other areas, and it is this kind of "let me hold on to the past at all costs" that sends Roanoke's young people to places like Atlanta and Charlotte where they have constructed new stadiums. She stated that the Council has listened, it has debated the issue, and it reached a decision in May 2001 to construct a stadium/amphitheater on Orange Avenue.

Council Member Dowe referred to numerous contacts by citizens regarding the issue, and the one question he has asked repeatedly is whether those same citizens use Victory Stadium for anything other than the Fourth of July celebration. He also referred to Roanoke's young people who have expressed excitement because they believed that Roanoke might be constructing a new stadium/amphitheater facility; and if the question is placed on a referendum for a vote by the citizens, a majority of the young people are not of voting age, therefore, their voice will not be heard in the decision. He also referred to dialogue with young people who have moved away from the Roanoke Valley who state that one of the main reasons they left Roanoke was due to the lack of progress and the perception that Roanoke is not moving forward, therefore, they do not wish to return to the Roanoke Valley to live. He added that if there are promoters who are reluctant to bring entertainment venues to Victory Stadium because of its proximity to a hospital, it would be detrimental for entertainment to be a part of Victory Stadium, or an amphitheater. He referred to optimism by some citizens regarding the ability to do new things at a new place, and asked the following question of Roanoke's citizens: If Victory Stadium is renovated, will the citizens of Roanoke support the facility at times other than the Fourth of July celebrations.

Council Member Bestpitch referred to previous comments regarding the success of Shaftman Performance Hall at the Jefferson Center, however, one of the reasons that Shaftman Performance Hall has succeeded beyond the expectations of many is because the facility is the right size. He referred to recent high profile performances at the Roanoke Civic Center that were not sold out events, therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the City can sell thousands of tickets to 30+ outdoor performances at a stand alone amphitheater. He stated that all persons who have expressed an opinion on the issue have a sincere interest in what is best for the future of the City of Roanoke; Ms. Wyatt previously mentioned Council's process in reaching its previous decision; Mr. Wishneff pointed out that there was not a great

deal of public discussion about the decision to change the location and to construct a new facility in a different location; and the Council should have done a better job of communicating the design and the proposal to the public prior to voting on the issue. Therefore, Mr. Bestpitch moved that the July 21, 2003 meeting of City Council be recessed until Thursday, July 31, 2003, in the Roanoke Civic Center Auditorium, for the purpose of holding a public forum on the proposed stadium/amphitheater project, to enable the issue to be explained to the public. He encouraged the City administration to solicit assistance by news media throughout the community to serve on a panel to receive and review written questions to ensure that there are a variety of questions without duplication. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler.

The Mayor suggested that Council establish the ground rules as to composition of the panel; whereupon, Mr. Bestpitch clarified his motion to provide that the City administration will include as many members of the news media as possible by including a broad representative panel consisting of newspapers, radio stations, and television stations; and questions will be submitted by the public.

Vice-Mayor Harris advised that his sense from the community is that there is an overwhelming majority who believe that the stadium/amphitheater at the Orange Avenue site is the wrong project in the wrong place for the wrong amount of money, which is not to say that he does not see merit in the new stadium/amphitheater. However, he stated that the point he would like to make is that the \$18 million is not a check that Nelson Harris will have to write, it is a rather large check that involves the money of Roanoke's citizens, and it is unwise for the Council to continue down a path of an \$18 million project which, the overwhelming majority of the community, does not want and does not support. He stated that the public forum could be held, but it appears to be a little too late; the entire idea of representative democracy is that the Council is elected to represent the will of the community, which is a responsibility that he takes seriously, and he will try to honor what he has heard in an overwhelming way from the citizens of the City of Roanoke. He stated that he will support the motion, although it is not a wise stewardship of the Council's time; and during the public forum process, he asked that citizens be given the opportunity to respond or to share their opinions.

The Mayor called attention to a different point of view on the stadium/amphitheater project, and inquired if representatives of Citizens for a Sensible Stadium Decision will be afforded the opportunity during the public forum to present their views; whereupon, Mr. Bestpitch clarified that that was not the intent of his motion.

Following further discussion, by consensus of the Council, the following motion offered by Mr. Bestpitch, seconded by Mr. Cutler, with friendly amendments proposed during the discussion, was adopted:

A public forum will be held on Thursday, July 31, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., in the Auditorium of the Roanoke Civic Center, with regard to the proposed stadium/amphitheater project.

7:00 - 7:30 p.m. Presentations by City staff/consultants, etc.

7:30 - 8:00 p.m. Questions from citizens

8:00 p.m. - until Remarks by citizens

At 4:05 p.m., Council Member Bestpitch left the meeting.

COMMITTEES-HOUSING/AUTHORITY: Brenda Powell, Chair, Fair Housing Board, presented the 2003 Annual Report of the Fair Housing Board.

Ms. Powell advised that for the fiscal year 2003, the Fair Housing Board began the task of addressing the 42 impediments in the 2001 Fair Housing Study; community meetings were held to help categorize and prioritize the list of impediments and impediments fell into three main categories: Regional Cooperation, Regional Transportation, and Education and Outreach.

With regard to Regional Cooperation, she stated that Council is requested to develop a strategy to address fair housing with other surrounding governments because it is important to all citizens to live harmoniously together in the Roanoke Valley, to share the housing burden, and to live free of discrimination. She added that Council is requested to address Regional Transportation with surrounding governments and businesses because it affects all citizens, personnel and productivity, and it places a limitation on housing choices and affects economic status. In regard to education and outreach, Ms. Powell advised that the Fair Housing Board addressed fair housing through training sessions for Board members, staff and housing providers, a facilitator from the Virginia Fair Housing Office participated and 25 persons attended the training sessions; two workshops on zoning and fair housing were held, which were attended by Fair Housing Board members, City staff, members of the Board of Zoning Appeals, the Architectural Review Board and personnel and housing providers from the City of Salem and Roanoke County; Members of the Fair Housing Board attended the Annual Housing Conference which was held at The Hotel Roanoke, they attended and co-sponsored

12

the Housing Seminar with the Roanoke Regional Housing Network; members are working to bring the City's fair housing ordinance into compliance and they are also working on a Fair Housing booklet; a Fair Housing Fair was held at Valley View Mall; fair housing awareness has been created using billboards throughout the City; and members of the Board participated in the Southeast by Design Family Fun Day with displays and handouts .

In summary, Ms. Powell advised that there is an increased awareness and knowledge of fair housing in the City of Roanoke; the City is on its way to providing a better housing arena for all citizens to participate fully in the housing market without social or economic discrimination; concerns for next fiscal year include: education and outreach, to serve as advisors, to complete the fair housing pamphlet/booklet, to check on the status of regional cooperation and transportation, and most of all, to begin the process where the City of Roanoke is the leader in fair housing.

Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the Annual Report would be received and filed.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS:

CITY MANAGER:

BRIEFINGS: NONE.

ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR ACTION:

LANDMARKS/HIST.PRESERVATION: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Certified Local Government Program (CLG) establishes a partnership between local governments, the Federal Historic Preservation Program, and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR); the program allows VDHR to certify local governments for their preservation program in exchange for future funding opportunities; goals of the program are to promote viable communities through preservation, to recognize and to reward communities with sound local preservation programs, and to establish credentials of quality for local preservation programs; and 24 local governments in Virginia currently have CLG status, including the Cities of Alexandria, Charlottesville, Lynchburg, Richmond, Williamsburg, and Winchester.

It was further advised that acceptance into the CLG program enables localities to be eligible to apply for grants that can be used for a variety of purposes; grants are typically on a 50/50 match basis and can be used for survey and nomination of historic areas or properties, preservation planning, public education programs, training, and rehabilitation of historic public buildings; and should the City apply for and be awarded any such grants in the future, local match funding would have to be identified.

It was explained that listing on the National Register of Historic places is an economic development and revitalization tool because of rehabilitation tax credits that are available; many areas of the City may be eligible for listing on the National Register, but need to be surveyed and nominated; and the CLG program would make grant money available for an ongoing historic survey program in the City of Roanoke.

It was further explained that the Vision 2001-2020 Comprehensive Plan supports the survey and nomination of historic districts, and recommends that Roanoke undertake a comprehensive inventory of historic properties and areas in the City and consider historic districts; the plan further recommends that neighborhood and stakeholder input be considered in the inventories, and the City should promote local, State and Federal incentives to encourage rehabilitation of historic districts; the City's current program meets requirements for becoming a Certified Local Government; no change in the City Code, or the City's policies, or practices is required; and to maintain Certified Local Government Status, an annual report on activities to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources is required.

The City Manager recommended that Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to apply for acceptance into the Certified Local Government Program and to execute the necessary documents.

Mr. Dowe offered the following resolution:

(#36430-072103) A RESOLUTION authorizing the City Manager to apply for acceptance into the Certified Local Government Program of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources; and to take other related actions as necessary.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 97, page 508.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Resolution No. 36430-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

BUDGET-GRANTS-YOUTH: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Department of Criminal Justice Services notified the City of Roanoke and Roanoke County of an allocation of funds under the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program (JAIBG); allocation of \$48,493.00 in Federal funds was awarded jointly to the two jurisdictions, and a joint local match of \$5,388.00 is required.

It was further advised that the allocation formula provides \$34,706.00 Federal and \$3,856.00 match for the City of Roanoke, and \$13,787.00 Federal and \$1,532.00 match for Roanoke County; staff from both jurisdictions have met and developed program proposals for use of the funds; Roanoke County will provide a substance abuse intervention education program through the schools; the City of Roanoke, in collaboration with the Boys & Girls Club, will provide services to students suspended or otherwise absent from school during the day; funding for the City's match of \$3,856.00 is available in Account No. 001-631-3330-1002, Outreach Detention; and the City of Roanoke will serve as fiscal agent for the funds.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to accept the \$48,493.00 JAIBG grant allocated to the City of Roanoke for \$34,706.00, and to Roanoke County for \$13,787.00 and to execute the agreement with the Department of Criminal Justice Services; that Council appropriate \$53,851.00 and increase corresponding revenue estimates of \$48,493.00 in Federal funds and \$1,532.00 in County match funds in accounts to be established by the Director of Finance in the Grant Fund Account and transfer \$3,856.00 from Outreach Detention, Account No. 001-631-3330-1002, to the above established Grant Fund account.

Mr. Harris offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36431-072103) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2003-2004 General and Grant Funds Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 97, page 510.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36431-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

Mr. Dowe offered the following resolution:

(#36432-072103) A RESOLUTION authorizing acceptance of a Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services on behalf of the City, authorizing execution of any and all necessary documents to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant and applicable laws, regulations, and requirements pertaining thereto.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 97, page 512.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Resolution No. 36432-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe, and Mayor Smith -----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

BUDGET-GRANTS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that notification has been received from the Commonwealth of Virginia Commission for the Arts that a \$5,000.00 Local Government Challenge Grant has been awarded to the City of Roanoke; and application for the grant was made at the request of the Arts Council of Roanoke Valley, Mill Mountain Theatre, Opera Roanoke, Roanoke Symphony Orchestra, and Young Audiences of Virginia.

It was further advised that in order to receive the funds, the Commission must obtain written confirmation that local tax revenue dollars will be used to match or exceed the amount of the grant; and for fiscal year 2003-04, the above referenced organizations will receive local tax dollar funding through the Roanoke Arts Commission, in the following amounts.

Arts Council of Blue Ridge	\$13,165.00
Mill Mountain Theatre	11,665.00
Opera Roanoke	7,966.00
Roanoke Symphony Orchestra	26,865.00
Young Audiences of Virginia	3,966.00

Grant funds will be distributed to the five sponsoring agencies in the amount of \$1,000.00 each.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to execute the necessary documents, including documents that will provide for indemnification by the City, which are required for acceptance of the grant, to be approved as to form by the City Attorney; appropriate \$5,000.00 in State grant funds and establish a corresponding revenue estimate in accounts to be established by the Director of Finance in the Grant Fund entitled, "Challenge Grant FY 04".

Ms. Wyatt offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36433-072103) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2003-2004 Grant Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 97, page 513.)

Ms. Wyatt moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36433-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

Mr. Dowe offered the following resolution:

(#36434-072103) A RESOLUTION authorizing the acceptance of a Local Government Challenge Grant from the Virginia Commission for the Arts.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 97, page 514.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Resolution No. 36434-072103. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wyatt and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

FDETC: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the proposed Workforce Investment Area III Chief Local Elected Officials Charter Agreement will replace the existing agreement continuing the Fifth District Employment and Training Consortium; the purpose of the prior local governmental agreement between the participating jurisdictions was for administration of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) through continuation of the Fifth District Employment and Training Consortium (FDETC), an agency established to provide administrative and programmatic oversight of regional workforce development initiatives; and since that time, the FDETC has closed its doors and jurisdictional membership was changed when the City of Clifton Forge voted to join Alleghany County.

It was explained that:

- The existing Agreement should be replaced with a document that accurately reflects the current situation, dissolution of the FDETC and revised membership.
- Federal WIA regulations allow the reconfiguration of service delivery areas to reflect and accommodate regional priorities and alliances such as the addition of Clifton Forge to Alleghany County.

The City Manager recommended that Council approve the Workforce Investment Area III Chief Local Elected Officials Charter Agreement to reflect changes as above referenced.

Mr. Dowe offered the following resolution:

(#36435-072103) A RESOLUTION authorizing adoption of the Workforce Investment Area III Chief Local Elected Officials Charter Agreement to replace the existing Fifth District Employment and Training Consortium Agreement and authorizing the Mayor to execute such Agreement, upon certain terms and conditions.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 97, page 514.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Resolution No. 36435-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

BUDGET-GRANTS-FIFTH PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Fifth Planning District Commission Disability Services Board (DSB) is responsible to local governments and serves as a critical resource for needs assessment, information sharing and service opportunities for citizens with disabilities, their families and the community; the following jurisdictions in the Fifth Planning District have enacted resolutions

establishing participation in a regional effort and appointed a local official to serve: Cities of Roanoke, Salem and Covington, Counties of Roanoke, Craig, Botetourt and Alleghany, and the Towns of Clifton Forge and Vinton; and other members of the DSB include representatives from business and consumers.

It was further advised that Council authorized the Director of Finance to serve as fiscal agent for the Fifth Planning District Disabilities Services Board on September 25, 1995, pursuant to Resolution No. 32675-092595; the State Department of Rehabilitative Services has allocated funds in the amount of \$15,000.00 for a one-year period to provide direct services that will assist physical and sensory disabled individuals with home based personal care services; and the grantee, Family Services of Roanoke Valley, will provide the required \$1,666.00 cash match.

The City Manager recommended that Council appropriate \$15,000.00 in State grant funds for the DSB and establish a corresponding revenue estimate in certain accounts to be established by the Director of Finance in the Grant Fund.

Mr. Dowe offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36436-072103) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2003-2004 Grant Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 97, page 516.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36436-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

BUDGET-HOUSING/AUTHORITY-GRANTS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that on August 7, 2000, Council authorized the City Manager, by resolution, to apply to the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development for \$100,000.00 for the Derelict Structures Fund grant on behalf of the Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization and Two B

Investments; funds may be utilized for acquisition, demolition, removal, rehabilitation or repair of specific, targeted derelict structures; a 100 per cent match of local funds is required; funds were awarded and the funding agreement was executed between the City and the Department of Housing and Community Development on May 29, 2001; the Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization has expended its \$50,000.00 allocation; due to unforeseen issues, Two B Investments was unable to utilize funds as required in a timely manner; therefore, the City of Roanoke has \$50,000.00 in unexpended funds available.

It was further advised that at this time Blue Ridge Housing Development Corporation ("Blue Ridge"), a local non-profit housing group, wishes to use the remaining \$50,000.00 to renovate property located at 1018 Jamison Avenue, S. E., which property is located in the Southeast by Design neighborhood; the house was constructed in 1900 and contains 2,793 square feet; the property is vacant and in poor condition and has experienced partial gutting; proposed redevelopment includes gutting, interior and exterior rehabilitation, electrical and plumbing upgrades, HVAC and emergency upgrades, and water and sewer upgrades; Blue Ridge Housing Development Corp. can immediately begin work on the property for use as a showcase property to market the Southeast project; the property was last used as a four-unit residence and renovations would convert the structure back to a duplex featuring the ability to live in one side and rent out the other side; and Blue Ridge Housing Development Corp. is committing \$70,000.00 from line of credit, and in partnership with TAP will commit another \$30,000.00 in private funds for match.

The City Manager recommended that Council allocate the remaining \$50,000.00 Derelict Structures Fund grant to Blue Ridge Housing Development Corp. on a reimbursement basis, and authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement between the City of Roanoke and Blue Ridge Housing Development Corp.

Mr. Cutler offered the following resolution:

"A RESOLUTION authorizing execution of an Agreement between the City and Blue Ridge Housing Development Corporation in order to provide funds from the Derelict Structures Fund, in the amount of \$50,000.00, to Blue Ridge Housing Development Corporation for renovation of property located at 1018 Jamison Avenue, upon certain terms and conditions."

Mr. Cutler moved the adoption of the resolution. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe.

Mr. E. Duane Howard, 508B Walnut Avenue, S. W., advised that Council Member Dowe should abstain from voting due to a possible conflict of interest inasmuch as he is the recipient of a home through Blue Ridge Housing Development Corporation and a close relative serves on the Board of Directors of Blue Ridge Housing Development Corporation. He stated that it appears that \$150,000.00 will be expended for renovations to the house, while the property next door is valued at \$58,000.00 and another house in close proximity is valued at \$59,700.00. He advised that the City states that it does not have the necessary funds to renovate Victory Stadium, but it appears that the City \$150,000.00 to invest in renovating a house in southeast Roanoke that is in poor condition.

The City Manager advised that the monies represent available State funds set aside for derelict structures; a significant appreciation will occur in the homes as work continues, and the house in question is believed to be a good use of Derelict Structure grant fund monies. She explained that two-thirds of the funds will come from private sources, no City money will be placed in the project, other than the Southeast By Design program; and the program addresses several of the City's goals to increase home ownership and to remove rental property in the southeast section of the City.

The Mayor advised that it appears that \$70,000.00 will be committed by Blue Ridge Housing Development Corporation and \$30,000.00 will be committed by Total Action Against Poverty, with the City of Roanoke authorizing another \$50,000.00, for a total renovation cost of \$150,000.00; whereupon, he requested a clarification by the City Manager. He also inquired as to how Derelict Structures grant funds have been used in the past and opportunities for future expenditure of funds.

The City Manager advised that the \$50,000.00 has been allocated to the City for approximately two years, the City worked with a property owner in the Warehouse Row area that did not proceed with renovation as was indicated, and the City has been requested to reallocate the funds to another project within the City, or to return the funds to the State. She explained that at the time funds were appropriated approximately two years ago, the City received a total of \$100,000.00, \$50,000.00 of which was allocated to the Warehouse Row project, and the other \$50,000.00 was allocated to a project sponsored by the Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization which has now been completed. She stated that she would confer with City staff to address the Mayor's questions and respond to the matter either before the end of the Council meeting, or at the Council meeting on Monday, August 4, 2003.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES:

BUDGET-SCHOOLS: A communication from the Roanoke City School Board requesting appropriation of the following, was before Council.

- **\$800,000.00 for the Patrick Henry High School project; funds will be used for architectural fees for development of construction documents and construction management services for the project.**
- **\$75,000.00 for the Comprehensive School Reform Grant for Huff Lane MicroVillage; funds will provide for replication of successful intervention programs from other school divisions at the school and provide staffing for a MicroSociety program, which includes staff development and skills instruction for students, to be 100 per cent reimbursed by Federal funds.**
- **\$75,000.00 for the Comprehensive School Reform Grant for Oakland School; funds will provide for replication of successful intervention programs from other school divisions at math skills instruction for students, to be 100 per cent reimbursed by Federal funds.**
- **\$50,000.00 for the Comprehensive School Reform Grant for Noel C. Taylor Learning Academy; funds will provide for replication of successful intervention programs from other school divisions at the school and implement a basic skills program, which includes staff development and remedial skills instruction, to be 100 per cent reimbursed by Federal funds.**
- **\$110,295.00 for the Schools' reading program; funds will pay for reading materials for elementary school reading programs; and a private donation has been received for the new program.**
- **\$5,000.00 for the D-Day Memorial Program; funds will pay for D-Day Memorial visitations by students; and a private donation has been received for the program.**

Mr. Dowe offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36437-072103) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2003-2004 School and School Capital Projects Funds Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 517.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36437-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: NONE.

INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS: NONE.

MOTIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

INQUIRIES AND/OR COMMENTS BY THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL:

TRAFFIC-TRANSPORTATION SAFETY: Council Member Cutler read into the record a communication from Whittington W. Clement, Secretary of Transportation, in connection with a resolution adopted by Council in support of rail alternatives to complement planned improvements to I-81.

TRAFFIC: Council Member Wyatt requested a briefing with regard to the traffic situation at Brandon Oaks Retirement Community.

HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS: The Mayor advised that Council sets this time as a priority for citizens to be heard, and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for any necessary and appropriate response, recommendation or report to Council.

ARMORY/STADIUM: Mr. Jim Fields, 17 Ridge Crest Road, Hardy, Virginia, spoke in favor of renovating Victory Stadium. He advised that Victory Stadium is a historical site because of its connection to World War II veterans and should be recognized as such. He commended Council for voting to hold a public forum on Victory Stadium on July 31 to allow the citizens of Roanoke to be heard. He stated that issues relative to the City's agreement with the Norfolk and Western Railway Company to maintain the land, and the cost of constructing a new stadium/amphitheater on Orange Avenue should be more fully addressed. He inquired as to why an American flag is not flown at Victory Stadium.

Mr. E. Duane Howard, 508B Walnut Avenue, S. W., encouraged Council to hold the public forum on the proposed stadium/amphitheater project on a Saturday to allow for broader citizen participation. He advised that sentiments expressed by citizens when signing the petition against the Orange Avenue site is that many people are excited about the proposed new stadium/amphitheater facility, but they were disappointed when they learned of the possibility that Victory Stadium might be torn down. He stated that the public forum should be handled in such a way that there is sufficient time for explanation of the project and for questions and remarks by citizens; therefore, holding the public forum on a Saturday and continuing until all speakers have been heard is the right thing to do.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS: NONE.

At 4:50 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess for two Closed Sessions.

At 5:50 p.m., the meeting reconvened in the Council Chamber, with Mayor Smith presiding and all Members of the Council in attendance, with the exception of Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch.

COUNCIL: With respect to the Closed Meeting just concluded, Mr. Harris moved that each Member of City Council certify to the best of his or her knowledge that: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in any motion by which any Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe, and Mayor Smith-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-FIFTH PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION: The Mayor advised that there is a vacancy on the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission, created by expiration of the term of office of David K. Lisk; whereupon, he opened the floor for nominations.

Ms. Wyatt placed in nomination the name of Jennifer L. Pfister.

There being no further nominations, Ms. Pfister was appointed as a member of the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission, for a term ending June 30, 2006, by the following vote:

FOR MS. PFISTER: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe, and Mayor Smith-----5.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-FLOOD REDUCTION/CONTROL: The Mayor advised that the one year term of office of Edgar V. Wheeler as a member of the Flood Plain Committee expired on June 30, 2003; whereupon, he opened the floor for nominations.

Ms. Wyatt placed in nomination the name of Edgar V. Wheeler.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Wheeler was reappointed as a member of the Flood Plain Committee for a one year term ending June 30, 2004, by the following vote:

FOR MR. WHEELER: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe, and Mayor Smith-----5.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

At 5:55 p.m., the Mayor declared the Council meeting in recess until 7:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber.

At 7:00 p.m., on Monday, July 21, 2003, the Council meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with Vice-Mayor C. Nelson Harris presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members M. Rupert Cutler, Alfred T. Dowe, Jr., Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr. (arrived late), C. Nelson Harris, Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith (arrived late)-----6.

ABSENT: Council Member William D. Bestpitch-----1.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The invocation was delivered by Vice-Mayor Harris.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Vice-Mayor Harris.

PRESENTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

ACTS OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Vice-Mayor Harris advised that Shining Star Awards are presented to persons who go above and beyond the call of duty to be of service to their fellow man and woman and to their community.

On behalf of the Members of Council and citizens of the City of Roanoke, he stated that he was pleased to present a Shining Star Award to Ms. Melissa Williams, a dispatcher in the City's 911 Center. He explained that on the evening of June 11, 2003, the 911 Center received a suspicious circumstances call advising that a male subject had been talking to a friend who was staying at a local hotel; the victim was talking from a cell phone in the parking lot of the hotel when the victim's friend heard some type of altercation over the telephone and the telephone line was disconnected; Dispatcher Williams was working the police board on this particular evening and dispatched the call; police officers, without success, checked the parking lot for the victim's vehicle, and then called the victim's cell phone number because they believed that there was a possibility of foul play. He further explained

that Dispatcher Williams contacted the victim's credit card company and was advised that the victim had used a local ATM machine, at which point Dispatcher Williams arranged to have the video tape at the ATM forwarded to the Detective Bureau the following day. He advised that shortly thereafter, another jurisdiction contacted the City to advise that an individual had reported being abducted from a Roanoke hotel at gun point, forced into the trunk of her vehicle and she had escaped after the suspects let her sit in the back seat when stopping at an ATM; later, the victim's vehicle returned to Roanoke City where a police officer spotted it, a vehicle pursuit took place, and all three suspects were apprehended by police.

Vice-Mayor Harris advised that Dispatcher Williams remained on the job beyond her normal work hours in order to coordinate information with the next shift of dispatchers; and she is to be commended for her exemplary actions which helped to avert what could have been a more tragic outcome.

FIRE DEPARTMENT-ACTS OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Kenneth Harper, representing the Board of Directors and Members of Roanoke Emergency Medical Services, addressed Council on the occasion of the anniversary of 75 years of volunteer service to the Roanoke Valley. He advised that Julian Stanley Wise and nine other persons formed the Roanoke Life Saving Crew, the first of its kind, with the goal of providing emergency life saving skills at the scene of an accident, drowning or other emergency. He stated that word spread of the work of Roanoke's volunteers and many communities called upon them to aid in rescue efforts and to assist in organizing rescue squads in other areas; many advances in training and equipment have taken place during this time, but the idea of people helping people in need continues; and the citizens of Roanoke should be proud to be the home of the first life saving and first aid crew in the world.

Mr. Harper expressed appreciation to current and past City Council Members for their years of continued support, thereby keeping the history, vision and volunteer spirit of Julian Stanley Wise alive; whereupon, he presented a plaque to the City of Roanoke in recognition of Honorary Life Membership to Roanoke Emergency Medical Services.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-BUILDINGS/BUILDING DEPARTMENT-CITY PROPERTY-LEASES: Pursuant to notice of advertisement for bids, the Vice-Mayor advised that bids were to be received in the City Clerk's Office for extension of the lease agreement to an existing lease of City-owned buildings located at 117 and 119 Norfolk Avenue, S. W., until 1:00 p.m., on Monday, July 21, 2003, and the bids were to be held, unopened, by the City Clerk until the 7:00 p.m. session of Council; whereupon, the Vice-Mayor inquired if there were persons in the Council Chamber who had questions or objections with regard to the opening of the bids.

Hearing none, the Vice-Mayor called upon the City Clerk to open the bids; whereupon, the City Clerk advised that only one bid was received prior to the deadline from Warehouse Row, L. P.

The Vice-Mayor advised that the bid would be referred to the City Manager for report and recommendation to Council.

Pursuant to instructions by the Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 21, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in connection with a lease extension agreement to an existing lease of City-owned buildings located at 117 and 119 Norfolk Avenue, S. W., the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in *The Roanoke Times* on Monday, July 7, 2003, and Monday, July 14, 2003.

At this point, the Mayor entered the meeting and presided over the reminder of the Council session.

The City Manager submitted a communication advising that in August, 2002, the City of Roanoke entered into a lease agreement with Warehouse Row, L.P. for the lease of property known as the Warehouse Row buildings located at 117 and 119 Norfolk Avenue, S. W., for a 40 year term, beginning September 1, 2002; as Warehouse Row, L.P. is utilizing historic tax credits to fund renovation of the buildings, funding requires a lease greater than 39½ years from the time renovation is complete; and since renovation is expected to be complete in August, 2003, Warehouse Row, L.P. is requesting the City to amend the lease agreement so that the lease will provide for a term of 40 years, commencing July 25, 2003, which will allow Warehouse Row, L.P. to meet historic tax credit requirements, with all other terms of the existing lease to remain in full force and effect.

It was further advised that since the amendment and lease extension involve a period of more than five years, applicable statutes require an invitation to receive bids for the extension and a public hearing by the governing body; an invitation to bid and a notice of public hearing were advertised and bids were to be submitted by 1:00 p.m., on July 21, 2003, with a public hearing to be held by the Council at 7:00 p.m.

The City Manager recommended, following the public hearing and opening and consideration of the bids, that Council accept the most responsive bid and authorize the City Manager to execute a second amendment and lease extension to extend the lease of the property for a term of 40 years, commencing July 25, 2003, to be approved as to form by the City Attorney; and authorize the City Manager to take such further action as may be necessary to accomplish the lease extension.

Mr. Cutler offered the following ordinance:

(#36438-072103) AN ORDINANCE accepting the bid of Warehouse Row, L. P., and authorizing a second amendment and the extension of an existing lease between the City of Roanoke and Warehouse Row, L. P., for the lease of property known as the Warehouse Row Building located at 117 and 119 Norfolk Avenue, S. W., (the "Property"); authorizing the City Manager to execute such second amendment and lease extension; and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64, page 520.)

Mr. Cutler moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36438-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to be heard in connection with the matter.

Don Buffington, representing Warehouse Row, L. P., expressed appreciation for the City's support of the Warehouse Row project.

No other persons wishing to be heard, the Mayor declared the public hearing closed.

There being no questions/discussion by Council, Ordinance No. 36438-072103 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe, and Mayor Smith -----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Members Fitzpatrick and Bestpitch were absent.)

At this point, Council Member Fitzpatrick entered the meeting.

ZONING: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 21, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of Boutros and Sheila Melki that a tract of land located at 926 Indiana Avenue, N. E., identified as Official Tax No. 3060505, be rezoned from RM-1, Residential Multifamily, Low Density District, to CN, Neighborhood Commercial District, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in *The Roanoke Times* on Monday, July 7, 2003, and Monday, July 14, 2003.

The City Planning Commission submitted a written report advising that the subject parcel, zoned RM-1, Residential Multifamily, Low Density District, contains approximately 13,222 square feet; a 1,800 square foot, one story structure, formerly used as a church fellowship hall, is located on the subject parcel and fronts on Indiana Avenue; and a 900 square foot covered porch is attached to the eastern end of the building, was before Council.

It was further advised that the petitioner proposes to maintain the existing building and to provide an appliance repair center; such use would be permitted in a CN district; however, CN rezoning is inappropriate in this case; the CN district is intended to maintain or create commercial core areas within a neighborhood, rather than permitting the unplanned dispersion of commercial uses throughout the area; and a rezoning of the subject parcel of land in order to allow a single commercial use among primarily residential uses is not consistent with the intent of the CN district.

The City Planning Commission recommended that the request be denied; and advised that given the surrounding land use pattern and the intent of the CN, Neighborhood Commercial District, the Planning Commission cannot support the request for rezoning to CN.

Mr. Dowe offered the following ordinance:

"AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 306, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, to rezone certain property within the City; and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance."

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of the ordinance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to be heard in connection with the matter.

Eric R. Spencer, Attorney, representing Boutros and Sheila Melki, advised that his clients purchased a former church fellowship hall containing approximately 1800 square feet for the purpose of establishing a small appliance repair business; the property is separated from a Light Manufacturing zone by one viable residential property, and the owner of the property was present to express his support of the request for rezoning. He stated that even though the proposed use is not true neighborhood commercial, it is a viable use inasmuch as it is approximately 60 - 70 feet from a Light Manufacturing district.

Mr. Fred Crews, 918 Indiana Avenue, N. E., spoke in support of the request for rezoning. He advised that he owns property next door to the property in question, the building was sold to Mr. and Mrs. Melki under false pretenses, other businesses operate in the area, and Mr. Melki should be permitted to operate his small appliance business at the proposed location.

Mr. Richard Hendricks, 933 Missouri Avenue, N. E., advised that the community is a small neighborhood composed of single family homes; there are no sidewalks in the neighborhood and the only access from house to house is by street, therefore, a commercial property would increase traffic and lead to hazardous conditions for children who live in the neighborhood; more noise would be generated as a result of the commercial establishment and property values would

decease. He called attention to no trespassing signs which were installed on the property by the petitioners following denial of the request for rezoning by the City Planning Commission, and large appliances have been moved into the building by the petitioners. He stated that the neighborhood would like to grow with single family homes, rather than businesses, and asked that Council support the residents of the area by denying the proposed rezoning, thus allowing the neighborhood to remain a quiet and safe place to live.

Mr. Allen Mueller, 3299 Happy Hollow Road, Blacksburg, Virginia, Elder, Church of Christ, advised that a small appliance business will not impact traffic or threaten the safety of residents. He stated that the building purchased by Mr. Melki was not constructed for residential purposes, but for use as a fellowship hall, the building contains no bedrooms, a small kitchen area, two restrooms and a covered patio, therefore, in order for the structure to be used as a residence, major construction will be required.

R. Brian Townsend, Agent, City Planning Commission, called attention to a concern of the City Planning Commission in regard to establishing a commercial use in the middle of a residential neighborhood; and advised that the Planning Commission was swayed by the 32 signatures on a petition signed by residents of the neighborhood. He further advised that the City Planning Commission was also concerned that a significant amount of property in the area is currently zoned CN, C-2 and LM and intrusion of commercial zoning in this part of the neighborhood is not only inappropriate in relation to the City's Comprehensive Plan, but also inappropriate zoning in terms of the way a zoning pattern should take place. He noted that the property has a number of available uses other than residential and there are a number of uses, either permitted outright or by special exception from the Board of Zoning Appeals, that are available to the petitioners should the application for rezoning be denied; and there are 27 permitted uses in the CN district that would also be available to the petitioners, or their successors, at this location. He advised that the position of the City Planning Commission and staff is that CN zoning is more appropriate on a major or arterial street that does not have immediate exposure to the internal part of the neighborhood.

No other persons wishing to be heard, the Mayor declared the public hearing closed.

There being no discussion/questions by Council, the above referenced ordinance was lost by the following vote:

AYES: None-----0.

NAYS: Council Members Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Fitzpatrick and Mayor Smith-----5.

(Council Member Dowe abstained from voting.) (Council Member Bestpitch was absent.)

ZONING: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 21, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of HASI Partnership to amend proffered conditions to rezoning as set forth in Ordinance No. 30040-52190, repealed and amended by Ordinance No. 31443-051793, in connection with property located at 3342 Melrose Avenue, N. W., identified as Official Tax No. 2660417, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in *The Roanoke Times* on Friday, July 4, 2003, and Friday, July 11, 2003.

The City Planning Commission submitted a written report advising that in May, 1990, Official Tax No. 2660417 was rezoned from C-2, General Commercial District, to LM, Light Manufacturing District, conditional by the adoption of Ordinance No. 30040-52190; proffers were repealed and amended in May, 1993, pursuant to Ordinance No. 31443-051793; a petition to amend proffered conditions was filed on April 30, 2003, a first amended petition was filed on June 5, 2003, a second amended petition to amend proffered conditions was filed on June 26, 2003; and the petitioner requests that the following conditions be repealed:

The subject property shall be used only for any of the following purposes:

- (a) General storage and warehousing establishment engaged in the storage of miscellaneous merchandise not for sale on the same premises;
- (b) Establishment engaged in the wholesale distribution of goods; and
- (c) No outside storage will be allowed on the premises.

It was further advised that the petitioner requests that the following conditions be applied to Official Tax No. 2660417:

(1) The subject property shall be used only for any of the following purposes:

- (a) General storage and warehousing establishments engaged in the storage of miscellaneous merchandise not for sale on the same premises;
- (b) Establishments engaged in the wholesale distribution of goods;
- (c) Manufacturing establishments primarily engaged in the manufacture, assembly, mixing, processing or other processes related to the creation of new products and including as an accessory use, the retail sale of goods manufactured on the premises, where all such manufacturing, assembly, mixing, processing or other processes related to the creation of new products, and retail sales of goods manufactured on the premises, are wholly enclosed in a building;
- (d) Establishments engaged in the retail sale of building or construction supplies and equipment provided the gross floor area of such buildings is not less than 20,000 square feet;

(2) There will be no freestanding signage on the property;

(3) Any outside storage shall be screened with a solid fence (wood, vinyl, or metal) so as not to be visible from Melrose Avenue and from the cemetery.

It was explained that the attorney for the petitioner agreed to file a Second Amended Petition to modify the language of proffer number 3 to include the screening of any outdoor storage from the cemetery along the rear of the property, in addition to screening such outdoor storage from Melrose Avenue.

The City Planning Commission recommended the Council approve the request, as amended, given the surrounding land use pattern and proffered conditions.

Mr. Dowe offered the following ordinance:

(#36439-072103) AN ORDINANCE to amend §§36.1-3 and 36.1-4, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 266, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, in order to amend certain conditions presently binding upon certain property previously conditionally zoned from C-2, General Commercial District, to LM, Light Manufacturing District; and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 522.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36439-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris.

Edward A. Natt, Attorney, appeared before Council in support of the request of his client.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to be heard in connection with the matter. There being none, he declared the public hearing closed.

There being no discussion/questions by Council, Ordinance No. 36400-061603 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Fitzpatrick, Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Bestpitch was absent.)

EASEMENTS-NEWSPAPERS-DOWNTOWN ROANOKE, INCORPORATED-CENTER IN THE SQUARE: Pursuant to instructions by the Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 21, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, with regard to a proposal of the City of

Roanoke to allow encroachment into the public right-of-way of four modular newsracks, two of which are to be located near the SunTrust Building, 510 Jefferson Street, S. E., and two to be located at Market Square, S. E., near Center In The Square, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in *The Roanoke Times* on Wednesday, July 16, 2003.

The City Manager submitted a communication advising that City staff has worked with Downtown Roanoke, Inc., (DRI), and various publishers on the placement and appearance of news racks located along public sidewalks throughout the downtown area; two specific locations are currently being addressed to improve the appearance and safety of the racks and to allow various publishers to utilize a uniform modular news rack that will be owned and managed by DRI, eliminating individual racks at those two locations; and DRI has requested permission to install two of the modular news racks, with all necessary appurtenances thereto, at each of the two locations downtown where several individual racks are currently located; and the proposed racks will create encroachments into the public rights-of-way at Franklin Road and at Market Square.

It was further advised that the proposed encroachment at Franklin Road will extend approximately two feet into the sidewalk from the concrete planter; units measure 4 feet wide by 1.5 feet deep and 6 feet wide by 1.5 foot deep; both units are 5 feet high; the sidewalk of Franklin Road at this location is approximately 10 feet wide; the proposed encroachment at Market Square will extend approximately 2 feet into the sidewalk from the curb; the units are the same size as those proposed for the Franklin Road location; the sidewalk of Market Square at this location is approximately 17.5 feet wide; liability insurance and indemnification of the City of Roanoke by the applicant shall be provided, subject to approval of the City's Risk Manager; and the Architectural Review Board granted a Certificate of Appropriateness on July 10, 2003, for the two racks in Market Square inasmuch as they will be installed within an historic district.

The City Manager recommended that Council adopt an ordinance, to be executed by Downtown Roanoke, Inc., and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court for the City of Roanoke, granting a revocable license to allow installation of four modular news racks that encroach into the public rights-of-way as described above.

Mr. Dowe offered the following ordinance:

(#36440-072103) AN ORDINANCE granting a revocable license to permit the encroachment of two modular news racks extending approximately two (2) feet onto the sidewalk of Franklin Road and two modular news racks extending approximately two (2) feet onto the sidewalk of Market Square, S. E., upon certain terms and conditions; and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 523.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36440-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to be heard in connection with the matter. There being none, he declared the public hearing closed.

There was discussion with regard to the chaining of news racks to the City's infrastructure; whereupon, the City Manager advised that the City has increased enforcement and as many of the news racks as possible will be located off of the City's major arterial roadways. She stated that most major cities in the United States have experienced the same problem, and the proposed modular newsrack may be the solution for the future.

Question was raised as to whom will control the content of publications to be included in the news racks; whereupon, the City Manager advised that Downtown Roanoke, Inc., will contract with various companies for the placement of publications in the news racks. She stated that the City's involvement will be to authorize the necessary encroachments for the news racks to be located in the public rights-of-way in the same way that the City would approve an encroachment for an awning into public right-of-way, etc. She added that the expectation is that Downtown Roanoke, Inc., will recover its costs for the modular units, but the proposal is not intended to be a money making venture.

Ordinance No. 36440-072103 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Fitzpatrick, Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Bestpitch was absent.)

LEASES-TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT-WATER RESOURCES-EQUIPMENT:
Pursuant to instructions by the Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 21, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, with regard to a proposal of the City of Roanoke to lease a portion of the Summit Water Tank and ground site to Nextel WIP Lease Corp., d/b/a Nextel Partners, for installation of antennas and related equipment thereon to provide for radio and wireless telecommunications services, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in *The Roanoke Times* on Sunday, July 13, 2003.

The City Manager submitted a communication advising that Council approved and adopted the City of Roanoke Policy as to Wireless Telecommunications Facilities located on City property, dated January 21, 1997, pursuant to a recommendation of the Water Resources Committee dated February 3, 1997.

It was further advised that the City currently provides leased space on three water tanks to Virginia PCS Alliance, L.C., on four water tanks to Triton PCS Property Company, L.L.C., and on one water tank to Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless; and lease agreements with the companies for use of City water tank facilities provide that the agreements will expire on July 31, 2007, with an option to renew, each upon mutual agreement of the parties.

It was further advised that Nextel WIP Lease Corp., a Delaware corporation, d/b/a Nextel Partners, with its principal office located at 4500 Carillon Point, Kirkland, Washington, has requested to lease a portion of the Summit Water Tank and ground site, which is located in the area of 4500 Franklin Road, S. W., at the end of Summit Way Drive, S. W., Official Tax No. 5380121, to install directional antennas, connecting cables and appurtenances; and Virginia PCS and Triton currently lease space on the Summit Water Tank, however, City staff has determined that space is available for another wireless provider on the site.

It was explained that to lease the property, a lease agreement is required as well as a public hearing; terms and conditions of the lease are in accordance with the City of Roanoke Policy as to Wireless Telecommunication Facilities located on City Property dated January 21, 1997, and substantially similar to existing lease agreements with other entities using the City's water tanks; term of the lease will be for four years, commencing on August 1, 2003, and expiring on July 31, 2007, and may be renewed for up to two five year terms, upon mutual agreement by the parties; the lease requires that the lessee post security to guarantee removal of electronic facilities at the end of the lease, and security in the amount of \$8,500.00 will be required; and rental fees are as follows per month, per provider:

\$1,325.00/month from August 1, 2003, through
December 31, 2003.

\$1,550.00/month from January 1, 2004, through
December 31, 2004.

\$1,675.00/month from January 1, 2005, through July 31,
2007.

The City Manager recommended that Council approve and authorize the City Manager to execute a lease agreement between the City of Roanoke and Nextel WIP Lease Corp., a Delaware corporation, d/b/a Nextel Partners, in a form to be approved by the City Attorney; and authorize the City Manager to take such further actions and to execute such additional documents as may be necessary to implement and administer the lease agreement.

Mr. Fitzpatrick offered the following ordinance:

(#36441-072103) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the proper City officials to enter into a Lease Agreement between the City and Nextel WIP Lease Corp., a Delaware corporation, d/b/a Nextel Partners, for use of a portion of a City owned water tank and the site on which it sits, which is located in the area of 4500 Franklin Road S. W., at the end of Summit Way Drive, S. W., Tax Map No. 5380121, known as the Summit Water Tank, and which will provide that Nextel Partners will use such area for the placement, operation, and maintenance of personal communication system antennas and related equipment, upon certain terms and conditions; authorizing the City Manager to take such further action and execute such additional documents as may be necessary to implement and administer such Lease Agreement; and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 525.)

Mr. Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36441-072103. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to be heard in connection with the matter. There being none, he declared the public hearing closed.

There being no discussion/questions by Council, Ordinance No. 36441-072103 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Fitzpatrick, Harris, Wyatt, Cutler, Dowe and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Bestpitch was absent.)

HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS: The Mayor advised that Council sets this time as a priority for citizens to be heard, and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for any necessary and appropriate response, recommendation or report to Council.

COMPLAINTS-HOUSING/AUTHORITY: Mr. George Gunther, 3038 Melrose Avenue, N. W., addressed Council in reference to Melrose Towers, where he has been a resident for the past two years. He stated that he is being evicted from Melrose Towers because he called attention to the incompetency of management of the facility, and because he stood up for his rights and the rights of others residing at Melrose Towers.

POLICE DEPARTMENT-SCHOOLS: Mr. Ray Lewis, former School Resource Officer at Patrick Henry High School, advised that he would withdraw his grievance, which was filed against the Police Department, if the City Manager will agree not to change the School Resource Officer Program.

ARMORY/STADIUM: The following persons addressed Council with regard to Victory Stadium:

Mr. Brian Wishneff, 2913 Wycliffe Avenue, S. W., representing Citizens for a Sensible Stadium Decision, advised that at the 2:00 p.m. Council session, he presented a list of approximately 35 stadiums throughout the country; i.e.: Ohio State, Notre Dame, the Rose Bowl, the Orange Bowl, etc., and the one thing that all of the stadiums have in common is that they are older than Victory Stadium;

therefore, a certain segment of Roanokers are offended by comments that Victory Stadium has seen its better days, because older and more famous stadiums are still standing and being used. He stated that the cost to the City of renovating Victory Stadium, when taking into consideration certain tax credits, is approximately \$8 million and the true cost of the proposed new stadium/amphitheater project is over \$21 million. He added that the additional cost to the City, when considering operating costs and debt service costs, are over \$1 million more per year for the new stadium versus Victory Stadium, therefore, the economics are overwhelmingly in favor of renovating Victory Stadium. He called attention to a new eight foot flood wall that will begin construction in the spring of 2004, which, when completed will remove the issue of flooding at Victory Stadium; 4,000 - 5,000 parking spaces will be available as a result of the new Carilion Parking Garage, as well as 20 acres of land that will be purchased across Reserve Avenue by the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority as a part of the Biomedical Park. He stated that homes near the new stadium/amphitheater site on Orange Avenue are so close to the facility that it will cause a negative impact on property values; and throughout the United States, people are trying to re-create the old historic look which already exists in Roanoke with Victory Stadium; whereupon, he presented a rendering of what a new amphitheater adjacent to Victory Stadium could look like. He advised that he previously pointed out that no record could be found that Council had discussed the new stadium at a public meeting before the vote was taken on May 21, 2001; and it is unprecedented for Council to spend this amount of public money for this kind of public facility without a vote of the citizens by referendum. Therefore, he requested that Council allow the citizens of Roanoke to vote on the issue at a public referendum.

Mr. Marty Gordon, 2720 Peppers Ferry Road, Christiansburg, Virginia, former General Manager and Director of Operations of the Roanoke Rush, advised that during the three seasons that the Roanoke Rush played football at Victory Stadium, less than \$30,000.00 per year was spent to make the field playable; and four major problems existed: outdated public address equipment, cramped locker rooms, deteriorating bricks, and bad field drainage. He stated that he did not wish to speak against the proposed new stadium/amphitheater, and not as a representative of any current or past sports organizations, and his purpose was to speak as an individual citizen. He advised that Victory Stadium could be improved by expanding current locker rooms and problems associated with noise could be addressed by tearing down the current press box and constructing a new press box on the visitor side of Victory stadium.

Mr. Robert Andrews, 1212 Lakewood Drive, S. W., spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium for future generations of young people who wish to play and enjoy sports at the facility.

Mr. Tom Link, 2201 Carolina Avenue, S. W., advised that amateur sports is big business and could be even bigger for Roanoke City and for the entire Roanoke Valley if Victory Stadium is marketed correctly; and there are valid reasons why Victory Stadium should be renovated and funds invested to make the facility a focal point for the entire Roanoke Valley. He advised that in the 1970's, the City fathers of Indianapolis, Indiana, decided to make sports a part of the City's economic development plan, the result was \$1.18 billion in economic income over a 20 year period, resulting in \$400 million in construction and \$693 million in payrolls, for an investment of \$124 million by the City, which represents a nine to one return on investment. He stated that no location in the City of Roanoke offers a comparable site to Victory Stadium, and asked that Council imagine a total complex with soccer fields, tennis courts, football fields, softball fields, a baseball field, completion of 170,000 square feet of space, with multiple courts for basketball, volleyball, indoor soccer, inline hockey, squash, handball, fitness, cheerleading, state of the art lighting, a new scoreboard complete with video and graphics, the land between Victory Stadium and Maher Field being used as an amphitheater, the river bank being cleaned up to allow for a canoe and kyaking school along the river, and a trolley connecting Victory Stadium and Crystal Spring with downtown Roanoke, the Virginia Museum of Transportation and the Roanoke Civic Center. He added that once the campus for the biomedical institute is in place, knowledge workers will make Roanoke their home.

Mr. John Graybill, 2443 Tillett Road, S. W., called attention to the deteriorated condition of Jefferson High School prior to renovation, and advised that Victory Stadium has not yet fallen into the same state of disrepair and could be renovated. He also called attention to other renovated sites throughout the City, such as the Grandin Theater, Warehouse Rowe, and neighborhood revitalization, etc. He stated that when he served as Principal of Patrick Henry High School, he received no complaints that Victory Stadium was too large, or there was excessive noise, or there was a lack of parking. He referred to competition with the City of Salem and the venues that are hosted by the City of Salem, as opposed to the City of Roanoke, such as the Roanoke Fair which was held at Victory Stadium for many years in the past. He encouraged the City to renovate Victory Stadium and properly promote the facility in the future.

Mr. Tom Bradley, 2042 Westover Avenue, S. W., advised that numerous businesses in the Roanoke Valley would be willing to donate labor and/or products so that Victory Stadium could be renovated.

Mr. Elliott Wheeler, 1408 Maiden Lane, S. W., inquired if the City will be required to return the land to Norfolk Southern if a decision is made to demolish Victory Stadium, pursuant to the terms of a previous agreement.

Mr. Mark Hurley, 1018 Howbert Avenue, S. W., advised that Council has not heard a great deal from those persons who are in favor of the new stadium/amphitheater project on Orange Avenue because Council voted in May 2001 to construct the new facility; and to renovate Victory Stadium to a quality facility will cost more than constructing a new facility. He stated that those cities throughout the United States that have constructed classic stadiums for baseball, such as Tiger Field and Riverfront Stadium, discovered that in the long run the effectiveness of renovating the stadiums was not worth the effort, because new facilities will bring more people, more revenue, more economic growth and a better quality of life. He spoke against holding a referendum for a vote by citizens because the citizens of Roanoke elected the Members of City Council to make those kinds of decisions.

Ms. Barbara Myler, 912 Stewart Avenue, S. E., called attention to fond memories of Victory Stadium, and spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium so that Roanoke's children will have the opportunity to participate in sports. She advised that Victory Stadium should be renovated as a memorial to Roanoke's World War II veterans.

Mr. Jim Fields, 17 Ridge Crest Road, Hardy, Virginia, advised that very little money has been spent on Victory Stadium in approximately 30 years; therefore, he requested a complete cost analysis to fully renovate Victory Stadium, as compared to a new stadium/amphitheater. He stated that Victory Stadium was constructed as a tribute to World War II veterans and the citizens of Roanoke have a right to vote in a referendum on the future of the stadium. He added that based upon sentiments expressed by citizens when signing petitions to renovate Victory Stadium, approximately 80 per cent of Roanoke's citizens favor saving Victory Stadium, while 10 to 20 per cent do not know the entire story; therefore, all of the facts need to be presented so that citizens will know what is at stake.

Mr. Richard Lucas, 3019 Corbieshaw Road, S. W., advised that he was appalled at the idea of tearing down Victory Stadium for all of the reasons mentioned by previous speakers. He stated that Victory Stadium is a part of Roanoke's history, with Fourth of July celebrations that have become tradition, attended by thousands of persons from the Roanoke Valley, and there is no other facility in Roanoke that will accommodate that many people.

Mr. Robert Lynch, 2810 Floraland Drive, N. W., advised that Victory Stadium is a political issue as much as a financial issue for the citizens of Roanoke. He stated that the City of Roanoke requires and promotes the preservation of historic buildings in the downtown Roanoke and old southwest areas; therefore, the same principle should apply to preservation of Victory Stadium as a historic landmark; and the Carilion conglomerate should not dictate what happens to Victory Stadium.

He asked that Council place the issue on a referendum and allow the citizens of Roanoke to decide if they want a new stadium/amphitheater, or a renovation of Victory Stadium. He suggested that the Carilion Biomedical facility be constructed on the Orange Avenue site and allow Victory Stadium to remain at its current location.

Mr. Sherman Lea, 1638 Lonna Drive, N. W., advised that Citizens for a Sensible Stadium Decision, started its petition drive approximately 90 days ago, not knowing what kind of reaction it would receive from the public; and there has been an overwhelming public response with support that cuts across every segment of the community – geographic, social, ethnic, economic, political, gender, age – do not build the new stadium/amphitheater, but renovate current Victory Stadium. He explained that some people support Victory Stadium for sentimental reasons, some persons do not support the new stadium/amphitheater project because of traffic concerns and noise from the interstate, combining the two facilities, the potential for a negative impact on property values, costs, and some believe that construction of a separate amphitheater is a better alternative; but the one thing that all persons seem to agree on is the opportunity to give the citizens of Roanoke a chance to vote on the issue through a public referendum. On behalf of Citizens for a Sensible Stadium Decision, he presented the Mayor with petitions signed by approximately 5,126 Roanoke City voters and 2,040 signatures from persons throughout the Roanoke Valley.

The Reverend Johnny Stone, 1801 Lynn Street, N. W., spoke on behalf of the Gainsboro community and the Roanoke Valley, because the issue crosses racial and cultural lines since citizens of the City of Roanoke will pay for the new stadium, or renovations to Victory Stadium, with their tax dollars. He stated that the Lincoln Terrace and Gainsboro communities have fallen victim to the progress of the City of Roanoke many times in the past; and \$15 million plus has been devoted to the Lincoln 2000 project, therefore, he requested that the City not ruin a \$15 million community project with loud noise, bumper to bumper traffic, parking problems, and bright lights, etc. at the Orange Avenue site. He added that a new stadium is a good idea in the location of Victory Stadium.

Mr. Michael Flanery, 2211 Wycliffe Avenue, S. W., advised that he is a homeowner in the City Roanoke and a business owner in the Roanoke Valley. He stated that he envisions a first class facility that will be representative of the quality of Roanoke and the quality of life that exists in the Roanoke Valley. He advised that the worst decision that one can make, other than a bad decision, is no decision at all; and Victory Stadium is a monument in history for Roanoke and it cannot stand with a “band-aid treatment,” as evidenced in the past. He commented that Victory Stadium needs an all out 100 per cent effort by the City, and, if that is not to occur,

the City of Roanoke should pursue another course of action, because nothing would be a worse monument to the City and to the honor of World War II veterans than a crumbling stadium in another part of town. He encouraged Council to hold a public referendum to allow the citizens of Roanoke to vote on the issue and to enable citizens to come together and to support whatever decision is made by the voters and by the City Council.

Ms. Angela Norman, 1731 Michael Street, N. W., requested that Council reconsider its decision to construct a new stadium/amphitheater on Orange Avenue. She stated that although she is a strong advocate for economic development and for progress, she is equally concerned about the budget for the proposed new stadium/amphitheater project, the location, and parking issues. She addressed unexpected expenditures, the time factor, and other variables that would impact the construction of a new stadium. She advised that currently Route 460E is a highly traveled and often times congested area, especially at the proposed location, and expressed concern with regard to vehicle safety issues and pedestrian traffic; parking at the Roanoke Civic Center has been an ongoing problem, especially during major events, with the use of shuttles providing little relief, therefore, parking issues will be compounded with construction of the proposed new facility. She stated that the citizens of Roanoke should have a stronger and more decisive voice in the final outcome of a new stadium project; Victory Stadium is a historical landmark; and she strongly supports the renovation of Victory Stadium based on facts presented by Brian Wishneff, an economic development specialist, and others who have addressed the issue.

Mr. Chris Craft, 1501 East Gate Avenue, N. E., advised that if Victory Stadium is in disrepair, the City of Roanoke is to blame because it has neglected Victory Stadium for over 30 years. He called attention to events that are held at Victory Stadium such as the Cancer Walk, Festival in the Park, and the track is used for walking and jogging. He stated that if Victory Stadium had been properly maintained, the City of Roanoke could have hosted the Franklin Graham Crusade instead of the City of Salem, which would have brought more money into the City's coffers.

Mr. Robert Gravely, 3360 Hershberger Road, N. W., advised that citizens of Roanoke should have the opportunity to express their opinion in the form of a public referendum on the future of Victory Stadium; and with proper marketing, Victory Stadium could be a money making venture for the City. He spoke against the Orange Avenue site for the proposed new stadium/amphitheater because of the

existing traffic situation, and advised that if the Roanoke Civic Center is properly marketed, there will be a need to construct a larger civic center, which should be explored instead of constructing a new stadium/amphitheater. He stated that more development should be scattered throughout the City of Roanoke, as opposed to being concentrated in the downtown area.

Ms. Evelyn D. Bethel, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., demanded that Council provide for an official and binding referendum on the future of Victory Stadium, or a new stadium/amphitheater. In doing so, she also demanded that historic Victory Stadium be renovated if, upon review and an impartial decision based upon data, it is decided through a referendum by citizens of the Roanoke Valley, that a new stadium should be built, and citizens demand that the facility be constructed in a location where the quality of life of nearby residents will not be deteriorated, and where increased traffic will not have an impact on nearby neighborhoods if an amphitheater is to be built. She added that citizens demand that the facility be built in a quiet, serene place where entertainment, music and the arts will not be drowned out by the constant hum of traffic on nearby roadways, or noise from accidents and sirens. She advised that citizens demand a referendum instead of the stall and stop public forum which is scheduled for Thursday, July 31.

Mr. E. Duane Howard, 508 Walnut Avenue, S. W., advised that Council Members were elected by the citizens of the City of Roanoke to take actions, to serve in the best interest of the citizens of Roanoke, and to represent true democracy. He stated that the petitions that were filed with the Mayor and signed by over 5,000 citizens represent true democracy as to the wishes of the citizens of Roanoke regarding the fate of Victory Stadium.

Mr. Don Divers, 6112 Buckland Mill Road, N. W., raised questions with regard to the proposed new stadium/amphitheater and Victory Stadium cost comparisons; and spoke in support of placing the matter on a public referendum for a vote by the citizens of Roanoke. He asked that Council not make rash decisions regarding the Orange Avenue site which is not a good location for a new facility.

Alison Blanton, 1701 Arlington Road, S. W., appeared before Council as President of the Roanoke Valley Preservation Foundation, which was founded in 1988 as a non-profit valley wide organization to promote the preservation of historic, cultural, and natural resources in the Roanoke Valley. She called attention to The Hotel Roanoke, the N & W Passenger Station, the Grandin Theater, and other structures that were either vacant, abandoned, near demolition, or in decline, many

of which were included on the Historic Preservation's endangered sites list, and noted that both Victory Stadium and the riverfront access along the Roanoke River are included on the endangered sites list. She asked that the City of Roanoke work with the Preservation Foundation as partners to ensure that all parties are good stewards of Roanoke's historic resources; debate has taken place as to whether Victory Stadium is a historic landmark; and recently the Virginia Department of Historic Resources rendered an opinion that Victory Stadium is potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, however, the permission of the City of Roanoke is required before the determination can be made. She stated that citizens lament the fact that historic buildings such as the Academy of Music, the American Theater and others were demolished, and if given the opportunity to go back in time and rethink the decision, they would handle the issue quite differently today; therefore, she advised that Council is requested to do the right thing by Victory Stadium. She called attention to a policy in the City's Comprehensive Plan to identify and to preserve historic landmarks in the City; and the Roanoke Valley Preservation Foundation encourages the City of Roanoke to do so and offers its assistance. She stated that the Board of Directors does not oppose the new stadium/amphitheater project, but wishes to protect cultural, historic and natural resources; therefore, Council is encouraged to investigate the significance of historic landmark status for Victory Stadium and look at ways to renovate the facility.

Mr. Bill Tanger, 257 Dancing Tree Lane, Botetourt County, spoke as a member of the City's Flood Plain Committee, and as Chair of the Friends of the Roanoke River. As a person who has been involved with flood issues for approximately 30 years, specifically the Roanoke River, he stated that the Victory Stadium issue has prompted further debate that has been long over due and more facts, discussion and evaluation of alternatives are needed. On the issue of flooding at Victory Stadium, which has never been fully researched or considered, he advised that it is known that historically the stadium was flooded five times in its 61 year history; and had the new flood reduction project been in place, Victory Stadium would have flooded only once in 1985, which is classified as a 100 year flood. He noted that a Council Member recently stated that he could not see "spending millions of public dollars on a stadium in the flood way because sooner or later it would flood again"; however, using that logic, Mr. Tanger stated that the Sewage Treatment Plant should be relocated as well, since sooner or later the facility will flood again; and more reasonable is the decision to flood proof the Sewage Treatment Plant. To further illustrate the point, he stated that if the City were to stop spending public dollars on projects in the flood plain, it would be necessary to abandon the following City

projects: the City Market Building, the City Market, the Virginia Museum of Transportation, Center in the Square, the Art Museum, and the Roanoke bus station, etc., which does not include all private enterprise in the flood way amounting to hundreds of businesses. He added that another prime example is Carilion Roanoke Memorial Hospital which did not move out of the flood way, but instead flood proofed the facility, allowing the hospital to continue expansion of its facilities. He stated that the rationale to construct a new stadium/amphitheater because Victory Stadium might flood once in every 100 years is not a good enough reason.

There being no further business to come before the Council, at 8:45 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess to be reconvened on Thursday, July 31, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., in the Auditorium of the Roanoke Civic Center, for a public forum on the proposed stadium/amphitheater project to be located on Orange Avenue.

The regular meeting of Roanoke City Council which was recessed on Monday, July 21, 2003, until Thursday July 31, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., in the Auditorium of the Roanoke Civic Center, 710 Williamson Road, N. W., was called to order, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith, presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members William D. Bestpitch, M. Rupert Cutler, C. Nelson Harris, Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----5.

ABSENT: Council Members Alfred T. Dowe, Jr., and Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr.-----2.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The Mayor advised that the purpose of the meeting is to conduct a public forum on the proposed stadium/amphitheater project on Orange Avenue, N. W. He stated that the rules of Council will govern the proceedings; since all Members of Council have expressed opinions on the issue, an independent moderator will facilitate the meeting, while Council retains the right to interject with comments or questions, the rule of Council is that the session will be primarily to listen; and all questions are to be directed by the moderator to the presenters.

The Mayor introduced Frosty Landon, Moderator, retired editor of *The Roanoke Times* and founder and Executive Director of the Virginia Coalition for Open Government.

Mr. Landon explained that the agenda was structured as follows:

- 7:00 - 7:30 p.m. - Presentation on the new stadium/ amphitheater
- 7:30 - 8:00 p.m. - Responses to questions by City staff and experts
- 8:00 p.m. - until - Citizen comments and questions

Mr. Landon advised that citizens may participate in the meeting in the following ways:

(1) Persons may write their questions on a card to be supplied by City staff to be turned in by the end of the first presentation.

(2) Persons may sign up in the Lobby prior to 8:30 p.m., in order to make comments at a later time during the meeting.

He introduced the following members of the panel:

Fred Krenson, Rosser International

Ken MacDonald, Red Light Management

Charlie Anderson, Architect, City of Roanoke

Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance, City of Roanoke

Paul Anderson, Transportation Consultant, Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern

He also introduced John Carlin, Anchor, WSLs Television, Channel 10, who will assist in sorting through questions to be addressed during the question and answer portion of the meeting, and advised that questions will be sorted by priority and category to avoid duplication.

As background, Mr. Landon advised that Victory Stadium was constructed in 1942 and for more than a half century, the facility served the City well; in 1995 Council began a study of potential improvements; the Parks and Recreation Department prepared internal planning studies over the next two to three years; in 2000, an economic feasibility study was prepared by C. H. Johnson which recommended that the City build a new facility rather than renovate Victory Stadium; in August, 2000, the firm of Rosser International reviewed several renovation options at the current site; in 2001 Council considered the options and voted to seek other sites that would be suitable for a new stadium; and in 2001 Council voted to build a new stadium at the Williamson Road and Orange Avenue site. He stated that there have been previous opportunities for public input, although some persons believe that sufficient opportunities have not been provided; the users of an amphitheater-type structure and stadium were asked last year to provide their views as to what the City needs, what is feasible, how their needs, festivals, etc., could best be met; and City Council and City Planning Commission rezoning hearings were held; therefore, there has been some input. He advised that the community is sharply divided on the issue; therefore, Council would like to hear further input.

Fred Krenson, Vice-President, Rosser International, an architectural, engineering and planning firm, that specializes in design of mass seating and public performance venues, stadiums, arenas, amphitheaters, was the first presenter. He showed slides of facilities that Rosser International has designed throughout the United States, ranging from a 2000 seat stadium to an 81,000 seat olympic stadium and various size stadiums in between.

(For full text of Mr. Krenson's presentation, see transcript on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

The second presenter was Ken MacDonald, representing Red Light Management.

(For full text of Mr. MacDonald's presentation, see transcript on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

At this point, Mr. Landon introduced the question and answer portion of the meeting.

QUESTION: In regard to the deed of gift by which the City acquired the land on which Victory Stadium was constructed, which was based on the condition that the stadium would be constructed within three years and thereafter maintained by the City, the City argues that such a condition which took place in 1941 was too long ago. Therefore, why did the City obtain a release of the condition from Norfolk Southern releasing four feet of the 30 acres for the widening of Jefferson Street, but expressly reimposing the original condition and covenant? Were all Members of the Council aware of the covenant regarding the original stadium when Council voted for a new stadium? If so, how did Council justify violating the covenant?

ANSWER: William M. Hackworth, City Attorney, advised that the covenants generally require that the property be used for certain purposes, including recreational uses. Council has not made a decision on the use of Victory Stadium or removal of the stadium; therefore, other recreational uses for the site have not been discussed. The City Manager has been in contact with Norfolk Southern officials who have assured the City that they will release the covenants, but they would like to know what the eventual use of the property will be before they agree to release the covenants, which is not viewed as an impediment to future plans to develop the property.

QUESTION: What happened to the proposal for an all weather track in the new stadium project?

ANSWER: Fred Krenson advised that the proposal for an all weather track at the existing stadium site was feasible from a dimensional standpoint when raising the field was considered; however, a problem was encountered when the water retention berm proposed by the U. S. Corp of Engineers was placed on the north side of the Roanoke River, thus, the track would not physically fit on the existing stadium site. In regard to the new stadium site, the track would move the stands farther away from the football field and farther away from the potential for side staging; therefore, the decision was made to provide for tracks at the school sites at a considerably lower budget and to maximize the football game impact, as well as the amphitheater function from the stadium.

QUESTION: Why not construct a flood wall around the stadium with flood gates and sump pumps which would eliminate the issue of flooding?

ANSWER: Fred Krenson responded that the flood wall was one of the proposals in 1996 which basically requires a massive flood wall that would include the stadium and the armory. It was determined to be more expensive than the \$14 million option and was not the selected option in 1996.

QUESTION: Why hasn't relocating the armory, tearing down the building and using that area for a permanent covered stage been considered, and using the field with either folding chairs or benches that could be set up by City staff, or patrons could bring their own blankets and chairs?

ANSWER: Fred Krenson advised that tearing down the armory was considered as long as it was rebuilt at another location which would cost approximately \$10 million. If a stage is placed on that end of the stadium, it would be facing south which would reduce light and light control opportunities, and it is not a desirable direction for the stage to face in order to have less of a light impact on a performer in the late evening hours.

QUESTION: How much would it cost to tear down Victory Stadium and why is the figure not included as a cost in the Orange Avenue site?

ANSWER: Fred Krenson responded that no decision has been made to demolish Victory Stadium; however, the cost was analyzed in several other studies in the range of \$500,000.00.

QUESTION: The Virginia Department of Transportation recently said, after looking at the Williamson Road and Orange Avenue traffic problems, that no action could be taken to correct the problems because the cost would far outweigh the benefits. Why has this not been acknowledged?

ANSWER: Paul Anderson advised that the traffic management plan acknowledged that there will not be major improvements at either the I-581/Orange Avenue interchange, or along Williamson Road; the facility will be typical of most other entertainment facilities, with very little traffic most of the time; however, during events, there will be significant traffic, but the good thing is that events will be held at typically off peak hours. Williamson Road, being a busy roadway with four lanes and Orange Avenue being six lanes wide, has a lot of traffic during regular peak hours, but there is considerable available capacity during off peak traffic hours, and since events usually occur during off peak hours, the facility would take advantage of existing capacity, which is what the traffic management plan is built around.

QUESTION: When two events occur at the Civic Center, in the auditorium and the coliseum, how can a third event be held simultaneously across the street and still address all parking needs?

ANSWER: Paul Anderson advised such a scenario would add to the challenge. The same people will control the booking of the sites, it is a rare occurrence when two major events are booked at the same time, although it does happen; and the key will be in scheduling events and trying to provide some offset between start times of the events. When events are sold out, shuttles will be provided which is a concept that was tested at the Civic Center on shows in August and September, 2002. Free parking is available in the downtown parking garages, variable message signs along the interstate and along major arterials will advise patrons of parking conditions so they will know if the parking lots are full and where they can take advantage of free parking and shuttles to transport them to and from the site.

QUESTION: Why has no detailed budget been provided for all expenses relative to traffic control, or made available on line and in a prominent location?

ANSWER: Paul Anderson advised that budgets were produced for both the cost of operating the various events, including costs for shuttles, staff including police officers, bus drivers, and parking attendants at the various lots, upgrades to existing streets around the site, and a coordinated signal system and video surveillance equipment to help monitor the traffic situation. Charlie Anderson advised that a traffic plan has been implemented and tested, and the plan works; and the operational side of the traffic plan requires more police officers and variable messaging sign boards on the interstate and on other major arterials that connect the facility. Budget information is in the traffic plan for the various scenarios, the traffic study team looked at a number of different scenarios involving the individual facilities, including multiple events at both facilities and associated operational costs, and information is available in the City Engineer's Office.

QUESTION: Why would Roanoke be competitive for amphitheater events given Roanoke's population size compared to that of other amphitheaters?

ANSWER: Ken MacDonald advised that there was some skepticism with entertainment venues like Cher, Elton John and Lord of the Dance which were sell out shows. The Roanoke market has performed well and performed better than other markets of the same size. Promoters may not be able to run as many events through a market the size of Roanoke as some of the bigger markets, but if there are a reasonable number of events of a diverse nature and spaced chronologically apart,

Roanoke is a good performing market. The outdoor concert experience in some instances exceeds the indoor arena experience and if patrons want to see a show and if they experience a nice evening, outdoor events have proven to be successful.

QUESTION: Your past experience does not show any location that has a multiple use concept, such as Roanoke is proposing. If this design is state of the art, cite examples of other projects with both a stadium and an amphitheater.

ANSWER: Ken MacDonald advised that he has promoted shows in various stadiums; however, the difference is, Roanoke had the forethought to build the infrastructure for a concert in advance of the event. Quite often, football stadiums are built for football teams or by athletic directors for a single purpose, and other amenities are built afterwards. The advantage in Roanoke is that the need for shows has been anticipated and promoters will be able to produce shows at a lesser cost than going into a stadium that does not have any of the necessary amenities, which will make the facility more attractive and provide an opportunity for shows with attendance in the range of 10,000 - 12,000 persons. In most cases, when talking about a stadium event, promoters would need more than 10,000 - 12,000 people to make the economics of the event work.

QUESTION: If an amphitheater were built at Victory Stadium in the end zone of the current stadium, with modernization to the current facility, would it provide a good venue with openness, a good view and the lack of I-581 traffic, etc.

ANSWER: Mr. MacDonald advised that a show can conceivably be conducted at any location; but the key is holding an event at a location where people will want to come. The Victory Stadium location may not be any more attractive than the Orange Avenue site and unless there are real assurances that patrons will not get wet during rainfall and that the show will go on, he would not promote a show at Victory Stadium. When the Dave Matthews concert was booked, it was a known quantity that the concert might be flooded out; however, other acts would not have agreed to such a stipulation in which case the promoter would have to guarantee payment even in the event of rain.

Mr. Krenson responded that one of the positive features of the stadium/amphitheater proposal is joint use of dressing rooms, concessions and restrooms that would be used not only for entertainment, but for sporting events as well. In thinking about the value of the dollar, it is important to be wise stewards of finances, so the combination facility makes a lot of sense. If a new amphitheater is

constructed along with upgrades to Victory Stadium, it will be necessary to spend more money to replicate restrooms, concessions, etc., that will be used very few times during the year.

QUESTION: Why is this project being funded with general obligation bonds and not revenue bonds?

ANSWER: Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance, advised that it is less expensive to issue general obligation bonds than revenue bonds, because revenue bonds typically have a stream of revenue tied to them. Approximately five to six years ago, when the City was planning a stadium solution, the City began to set funds aside from its operating revenues each year in anticipation of either building a new stadium or renovating Victory Stadium; therefore, the City set aside an additional amount of funding until it reached an amount that the City could issue general obligation bonds without going the revenue bond route.

QUESTION: Does the \$18 million figure include the cost of the pedestrian bridge across Orange Avenue?

ANSWER: Mr. Krenson responded in the affirmative.

QUESTION: There are a number of questions about the intended use of the Victory Stadium site. When you (Mr. Krenson) heard from the City Council, user groups, etc., as to why the Victory Stadium site was not appropriate for stadium and amphitheater purposes, but might be more appropriate for other uses, flooding notwithstanding, what is the real agenda for the site? What did you hear on these issues when you were hired by the City? What does the City want to do with the land where Victory Stadium now stands and why is the City trying to get rid of the stadium from that location?

ANSWER: Mr. Krenson advised that his charge was to provide options for the Council to consider; options ranged from six to eight different ways to renovate the facility and recover all or a part of that, ways to keep the facility from flooding, ways to allow the facility to continue to flood, but on a reduced quality level, what would happen if the facility is torn down and a new facility is constructed, or construct recreational space on the site. There was no agenda on how to use the site.

QUESTION: Did the City pay \$200,000.00 for land that was assessed at \$37,000.00? Are the correct dollar figures being reported to citizens and to Council on the value of the land?

ANSWER: Mr. Hall advised that the City engages in what is referred to as market appraisal which means that it assesses all of the properties in the City, including private residences, reviews relative sale prices in the area, and the condition of properties, etc. He stated that he was not involved in the transaction; however, if one owns property in an area that is going to be developed, the property logically becomes more valuable if the property is needed for development of a project. He further stated that he was not aware of the details of the relativity between the assessed value of the property via the City's appraisal process each year, as opposed to what the real value of the property is when it is needed for the project site.

QUESTION: Why does the City claim that traffic problems are greater at the Victory Stadium site when the intersection of Jefferson Street and Reserve Avenue is rated on the traffic scale as a "B" and Orange Avenue and Williamson Road is rated as an "E"?

ANSWER: Paul Anderson spoke to the proposed new site inasmuch as traffic at the existing stadium site has not been analyzed. The level of service "E" at the Williamson Road and Orange Avenue intersection is based on peak hour traffic volumes which occur between 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m., 90 minutes ahead of when the peak real traffic for shows would occur; traffic drops off fairly significantly between 5:30 and 6:30 p.m. and again from 6:30 to 7:30 p.m.; therefore, the rating of "E" represents the volume that exists in the peak traffic hours. No analysis has been done on what the traffic volume would be in the off period; however, City staff is looking at placing police traffic control at the intersection to handle unique traffic flows that will come before and after an event. For the existing stadium, there would need to be a type of traffic management plan.

QUESTION: Were any sites outside Roanoke City limits considered? What would be the cost of constructing a stadium to accommodate high school football games and a large amphitheater in the area with ample parking for large performances in an area outside of the corporate limits of the City?

ANSWER: Mr. Krenson advised that no sites outside of the City were considered; costs would be considerably higher, mostly because of property requirements for a parking lot to accommodate at least 3000 cars if the facility were moved to a remote location. No parking inventory currently exists that would be useable land and if there were an occasional very large event, parking numbers would grow in excess of 5000 - 6000 spaces. It is not inconceivable, but significant issues would have to be considered relative to any remote site.

QUESTION: Has any thought been given to the fact that an 18,000 seat amphitheater will not hold the 22,000 persons who attended the 4th of July Music For Americans celebration at Victory Stadium?

ANSWER: Charlie Anderson advised that City staff on duty at the 2003 4th of July celebration counted between 15,000 - 16,000 persons, as opposed to the reported 22,000.

QUESTION: How much will it cost to tear down the existing stadium and who will pay for it?

ANSWER: Mr. Hall advised that the cost of tearing down the stadium would be borne by the City; however, no decision was made on the fate of Victory Stadium at the time that Council voted to build a new stadium/amphitheater.

QUESTION: Why did the City allow Victory Stadium to get in such a poor state of repair?

ANSWER: Mr. Landon referred to former City Managers and former City Council Members and advised that there could not be elaboration on the question by non policy makers.

QUESTION: How many times has Victory Stadium flooded in the past 50 years?

ANSWER: Charlie Anderson advised that the stadium flooded in 1972, 1978, 1985, 1992 and 2003.

QUESTION: The 100 year flood occurred in 1985. It has been said that proponents of saving Victory Stadium at its present site believe that with a berm and with the planned flood control project, only the 100 year flood would have hit Victory Stadium.

ANSWER: Charlie Anderson advised that the statement is not totally correct, the flood wall is designed to take a 25 - 30 year duration flood, and some of the floods would have passed the flood wall or the berm.

QUESTION: If seating capacity is reduced by going away from the large stadium, will the cost of tickets be increased to produce the same guaranteed revenues?

ANSWER: Ken MacDonald advised that the proposed new stadium is proposed to be designed to accommodate a variety of seating configurations. If a performer/act states that a certain amount of dollars is needed to entertain at a City facility, the promoter will make an educated guess on how many tickets will be sold; the promoter considers the cost of the act, plus the cost of producing the show, and divides that by the number of tickets that are believed will be sold, which is how the ticket price is determined. Every show is different, every artist's guarantee is different, and every cost of producing a show is different.

QUESTION: Has a projection been prepared on revenues and economic impact from the proposed facility on Orange Avenue? If there is an event with tickets selling at \$50.00 each and approximately 20,000 patrons, how much will be spent in the City beyond the ticket price?

ANSWER: Mr. MacDonald advised that it is a plus to have a stadium near other businesses, and if the stadium or amphitheater is isolated, no economic benefits will be achieved by adjacent businesses. Estimates are that a promoter can use as high as six times a ticket price to one time a ticket price, depending on the nature of the audience.

Mr. Landon read the following questions with regard to topics that are issues for the City administration and/or the City Council to address:

Did City Council or the City Manager recently talk with Carilion about the use of the stadium site for the bio medical facility?

What is the intended use of the site now occupied by Victory Stadium?

Has a regional facility been considered with Roanoke County and the City of Salem?

No one has shown a picture of the current Orange Avenue site and the view looking at the stadium, and perhaps that is because the site looks to I-581. Would you welcome the news media to the site to show the view?

A comment was made to the School Board by the City Manager that some high school traditions would have to be changed. What are those traditions?

Mr. Landon concluded the question and answer portion of the meeting and advised that the meeting would proceed to the public comment period. He asked that speakers limit their remarks to up to three minutes each.

W. Alvin Hudson, 1956 Hope Road, S. W., advised that he was a Member of City Council when the vote was taken on the Orange Avenue location; he did not have the opportunity to vote on the issue inasmuch as he was absent on the day that the vote was taken, but prior to the meeting, Council voted 7-0 to retain the Victory Stadium site; however, a Member of Council asked for the courtesy of looking at other locations, and at no time was he notified that the issue was to be brought up again. He stated that the matter was handled poorly by the City administration; and citizens should have been involved in the decision; comments continue to be made about the condition of Victory Stadium; however, Council should take into consideration the previous condition of The Hotel Roanoke, and Jefferson High School, and the old post office building, all of which the City and others took the time and the opportunity to renovate into the first class structures that they are today. He advised that Victory Stadium is a part of Roanoke's history and should be preserved; and Council should reconsider its decision and allow the citizens of Roanoke the opportunity to vote on the fate of Victory Stadium.

Mr. Jim Fields, 17 Ridge Crest Road, Hardy, Virginia, advised that the citizens of Roanoke have the right to vote on the future of Victory Stadium; the majority of persons in attendance favor renovating Victory Stadium; and referred to an agreement with Norfolk and Western Railway which states that the City of Roanoke will maintain the facility. He took issue with a recent newspaper article in which a Member of Council stated that Victory Stadium is crumbling; however, he conceded that the stadium is in need of repairs.

Ms. Kathryn Marlow, 405 Washington Avenue, S. W., spoke as a citizen having no nostalgia for Victory Stadium, but as a citizen looking at where the City is going and how it needs to get there. She advised that identifying progress as bigger, better, and faster is not what Roanoke should be about, because that is not the way to keep young people in the area and Roanoke should embrace what it has and pay attention to the wishes of the citizens who reside in the City. She stated that if Council has not decided what is to become of Victory Stadium, it would appear that no accurate cost is available for what is to be done at the Orange Avenue site, because either Victory Stadium will be demolished, or renovated, or the facility will be left to crumble as an eyesore, which is not a valid option. Second, she inquired as to how many houses and how many people will be displaced if the stadium is

moved to Orange Avenue, and why is the City not concerned about taking people's homes. She stated that renovating Victory Stadium will not displace people from their homes and should be taken into consideration by the City.

It was noted by a member of the City staff that no homes will be acquired as a result of the Williamson Road/Orange Avenue location for the proposed stadium/amphitheater.

Brian J. Wishneff, 1010 First Union Building, 213 South Jefferson Street, expressed amazement at some of the answers to the earlier questions by the panel. He asked if the consultants know that the City plans to purchase 22 acres of surface land across the street on Reserve Avenue that would be available for surface parking; do the consultants know that Carilion is constructing an 1100 car garage next to Victory Stadium; and do the consultants know that there are 4000 - 5000 potential parking spaces within walking distance, yet the consultants said in their report that there is not enough on site parking. Secondly, with regard to the close proximity to Carilion Roanoke Memorial, he added that a hospital spokesperson has stated that in the history of the hospital, there has never been one complaint about Victory Stadium. Thirdly, he advised that the consultants continue to state that the flood plain project will be completed 25 years from now, when, in truth, the project will start in the spring of 2004. With regard to flooding conditions, he stated that no floods, other than the 1985 flood, occurred more than once in 100 years, and not once every eight years as reported by the consultants.

Mr. Bill Tanger, 129 Thurston Avenue, N. E., advised that the process has failed and should have included public notice of the different issues and alternatives when alternatives were first proposed and voted on arbitrarily without any kind of public input or comment. He stated that his involvement does not stem from any emotional attachment to Victory Stadium, but because of what might happen to the Williamson Road area. He added that he appeared before Council and submitted numerous recommendations that would alleviate traffic problems; and the question about the pedestrian bridge is not whether the bridge goes over Orange Avenue, the question is whether it goes over Carver Avenue. Since the pedestrian bridge does go over Orange Avenue and drops down hill, he asked that persons in the audience visualize that they are in a wheelchair, on a long sloping ramp, when they get to the end of the ramp, they are at Carver Avenue traffic, they cross Carver Avenue traffic, and then wheel up 30 feet to get back to where they were on the other side of Orange Avenue, all of which does not make good sense. He advised that he suggested taking out the bottleneck at Plantation Road, but the City stated that

funds were not available; however, if the project is to be done, it should be done right. He stated that no studies have been conducted on the noise impact to the stadium, or to the residential area from the stadium/amphitheater, and no study has been done regarding the light impact; therefore, there are many unanswered questions. He spoke to the need to form a bipartisan commission, or group of objective persons, to compile facts, to prepare a comparative analysis, and to present the information at a referendum where citizens can vote on the issue.

Mr. Delvis O. "Mac" McCadden, 2102 Carroll Avenue, N. W., advised that some things might be legal, but that does not mean that they are right; and Council's 6 - 0 vote on the stadium/amphitheater issue might have been legal, but it was not right because citizens were not given the opportunity to voice their opinion; and when citizens looked at the proposed plans at the civic center, they were not aware that a vote was to be taken by the Council that same evening. He commended Council on its decision to do something, but expressed disappointment in how it was done. He called attention to a proposal that may be presented to Council in the near future to construct another facility on the Victory Stadium site using the same bricks that were used to construct Victory Stadium.

Ms. Melanie Steel, 1130 Howbert Avenue, S. W., a boxing promoter formerly associated with Victory Gym, a youth boxing program housed beneath Victory Stadium where thousands of dollars of equipment is setting dormant, including a full size boxing ring, advised that Victory Gym is not included in renovation photographs of Victory Stadium's current condition. She called attention to the potential for various uses of Victory Stadium, such as Victory Gym, concerts like Dave Matthews, and 4th of July celebrations, etc., that are not being taken into consideration. She stated that Victory Stadium deserves a second chance and just because something is "a little banged up" does not mean that it should be abandoned.

Mr. Ken Parry, 2601 Baird Street, S. W., advised that it is hoped that the issue will generate enough interest in the City of Roanoke by the citizens of Roanoke, homeowners and taxpayers, to demand that Council allow the matter to be brought to a democratic closure through a public referendum. He stated that the purpose of Council is to work in the best interest of the citizens that they were elected to represent and not spend taxpayers dollars on a mini-sized facility in the Williamson Road area. He advised that the City of Roanoke already has a stadium that can be renovated for \$9 - 10 million, thus saving taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Steve Colston, 1817 Northwoods Lane, Salem, Virginia, advised that there is a problem with both the current Victory Stadium and with the proposed new facility on Orange Avenue; however, if everything is even, why not allow sentimentalities to carry the day and retain a legacy, instead of building a new stadium/amphitheater and destroying Roanoke's past. He encouraged the City to maintain the legacy of Victory Stadium.

Mr. Robert Lynch, 2810 Floraland Drive, N. W., advised that he normally depends on those politicians that he voted for to speak for him, but in this case, his elected leaders have let him down by not allowing adequate citizen input into the original decision to build a new stadium. He stated that his first concern relates to the method used to reach a decision on the new stadium/amphitheater, and input by taxpayers and voters should have been the first consideration. He asked the following questions: Can Council honestly say that the voice of the citizens was heard in regard to the original decision to construct a new stadium? Can Council deny that the wants and needs of the Carilion conglomerate have not had any influence on the decision to build a new stadium and to demolish the current stadium? Do current and past City Council Members hold any responsibility for the current condition of Victory Stadium? At what point do the needs of government by big business, for big business, override the needs of taxpayers and the voting citizens of Roanoke. He stated that the people who favor the new stadium are those who stand to make a profit on the project, such as consultants, contractors, the Carilion corporation and others who will be involved in the construction process. He noted that it is time to let the people who will be paying the bill for the project have the opportunity to vote on how their tax dollars will be spent. He asked the following series of questions: Has anyone given serious thought to moving the Carilion project to the land that is proposed to be used for the new stadium/amphitheater, or is the City so afraid that it will offend the powers that be in the Carilion conglomerate, that they may abandon the bio-medical project, or move the project to another City? How many long term jobs will be provided by the Carilion project and how much will it cost the citizens of Roanoke to build the infrastructure needed to support the project? Will long term benefits be worth initial costs? Can anyone guarantee that a new stadium will be promoted aggressively enough to pay its own way? How can any facility generate enough revenue to support itself when it is not used on a regular basis? He asked that Council Members cause the issue to be placed on a referendum to be voted on by the citizens of Roanoke, whether it be a new stadium or a renovated Victory Stadium.

Mr. John R. Graybill, 2443 Tillett Road, S. W., spoke in support of renovating

Victory Stadium. He commended those persons in attendance, and asked that no vote be taken by the Council this evening since two members of the Council were absent and the citizens of Roanoke want to know their position regarding the fate of Victory Stadium. He stated that the flooding of Victory Stadium is not an issue because past costs have been addressed within the City's annual budget; and if Victory Stadium is properly marketed promoters will use the facility.

Dr. John Bohon, 5012 Cave Spring Circle, S. W., advised that Victory Stadium is the first World War II memorial in America. He stated that Victory Stadium is located in a beautiful place by the Roanoke River, with Mill Mountain overlooking the area; he worked in the vicinity of Victory Stadium for over 40 years and there were no complaints by the hospital regarding noise, other than the stock car races that were held for a short time. He advised that for some people, Victory Stadium is hallowed ground and encouraged Council to vote in favor of renovating the stadium for future generations of Roanokers.

Ms. Jessica Howe, 202 Madison Avenue, N. W., advised that memories live in one's heart, and one does not have to see a structure every day to remember it. She stated that a memorial to World War II veterans could be erected at the new stadium/amphitheater and a new stadium/amphitheater will make Roanoke a better place to live.

Ms. Shakira Moyer, 3738 Signal Hill Avenue, N. W., an upcoming junior at William Fleming High School, advised that Victory Stadium is crumbling; therefore, she spoke in support of a new stadium/amphitheater. She stated that to grow as a City means to advance in other areas; and a memorial could be constructed at the new stadium/amphitheater to honor World War II veterans. She added that the young people of Roanoke should be included in any type of vote and should be allowed to enjoy better facilities than the current Victory Stadium has to offer.

Mr. Darrell R. Boles, 1623 Shamrock Street, N. W., advised that the deteriorating condition of Victory Stadium occurred because the City failed to make the necessary repairs to the facility; and citizens of Roanoke should be allowed to have input into how their tax dollars are spent. He referred to stipulations of the agreement with Norfolk and Western Railway with regard to the use of Victory Stadium, and inquired if the land will revert back to Norfolk Southern if Victory Stadium is demolished. He inquired as to how the proposed amphitheater on Orange Avenue will compare, seating-wise, with other amphitheaters.

Ms. Patricia Rodriguez, 120 Twenty-third Street, S. E., called attention to conversations with Council Members regarding Victory Stadium, in which one Member of Council stated that he believed it is progressive to build a new stadium and it is important that Roanoke be seen by others as a progressive city, to which statement she strongly disagreed. In this day and age, she stated that being progressive means celebrating and renovating unique pieces of architecture; by renovating the past, the future is honored; people of all walks of life and every age group appreciate Victory Stadium because of events that have been held in the past; and if another stadium is constructed, Victory Stadium will eventually be torn down. She advised that Victory Stadium elicits a wonderful feeling, it is enabling to be seated in the stands, the size of the stadium is one of its many virtues, it is located on a beautiful site, and it is unique to have the backdrop of a mountain and a beautiful river running along side the stadium. She stated that she represents hundreds of persons who want to see Victory Stadium renovated, and asked that the citizens of Roanoke be allowed to vote on the fate of Victory Stadium through a public referendum.

Mr. Richard Rife, 1416 Sherwood Avenue, S. W., spoke in support of the proposed new stadium/amphitheater, because it is time to stop looking 50 years in the past and instead look 50 years into the future. He stated that Victory Stadium has served the community honorably and well, but its time has passed; as an architect and a preservationist, he stated that he supports the renovation of old structures, but he also knows that certain structures do not lend themselves to renovation and reuse; and his architectural firm designed the Jefferson Center, the Grandin Theater, and Breckinridge, Woodrow Wilson and Addison Middle Schools, but the design of these landmark buildings allowed them to be renovated into modern facilities that meet current and future needs. He stated that Victory Stadium cannot be cost effectively renovated to meet the needs of a modern sports entertainment venue; and the proposed new stadium/amphitheater facility represents a very innovative design that in years to come will be widely copied throughout the country. He agreed with previous speakers that the decision making process leading up to this evening's meeting leaves much to be desired, but Council's decision to construct a new stadium/amphitheater is the correct decision and he hopes Council will stand by its previous vote on the issue. He also agreed with previous speakers that it is nice to reminisce about past glories, but it is time to build a new venue in which to create new glories – it is time to build a new Victory Stadium.

Ms. Sarah Brooks, 2912 Avenham Avenue, S. W., spoke to the location of the proposed new stadium/amphitheater from the viewpoint of anyone who has tried to attend an event at the Roanoke Civic Center when more than one activity is being held concurrently; from the standpoint of one who has waited in traffic for up to 45 minutes only to be directed to an off-site venue to park, bused to the Civic Center and then back to the parking facility, following the event. She stated that to add a stadium/amphitheater to existing Civic Center parking problems will only compound the issue. Having been involved with Festival in the Park for a number of years, she stated that Roanoke does not have a good climate for outdoor events; those persons attending a football game will attend because they want to watch football and will sit in the rain regardless of weather conditions, but people will not pay money to sit in the rain to listen to a concert, even with a canopy over the facility. She advised that Victory Stadium provides a site that has reasonable access from I-581 and Route 419 and downtown Roanoke, there is a lot of history at the Victory Stadium site, and the site itself is far more practical, whether the current Victory Stadium is demolished and another facility is constructed, than constructing a stadium/amphitheater in an already congested area of the City.

Mr. Tom Link, 2201 Carolina Avenue, S. W., advised that the process that led to the public forum needs to be readdressed and both sides of the question should be taken into consideration; because the process of looking at only the Orange Avenue site does not provide citizens with all of the opportunities to express their opinion on both the Orange Avenue site and renovation of Victory Stadium. He stated that the City does not have to tear up the history of Victory Stadium to move to the future; for example: the rotunda at the University of Virginia which is under going renovations, Scott Stadium in Charlottesville started small and is now one of the largest stadiums in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and Roanoke can renovate Victory Stadium which is the biggest city-owned stadium in Virginia and make it the best. He advised that under the seats of Victory Stadium is approximately 340,000 square feet of space, which could be used for such things as basketball courts, volleyball courts, inline hockey and a multitude of other uses. He called attention to the 5000+ signatures of citizens who want to provide input as to the future of Victory Stadium, and suggested that a commission be appointed to review the overall issue and to submit recommendations that can be voted on at a public referendum.

Ms. Lynn Davis, 1674 Sigmon Road, S. W., advised that Victory Stadium provides a sense of place, it represents an icon to the community similar to the Mill Mountain Star, Mill Mountain Theater, the City Market, Jefferson High School, etc., and it is not possible to erect a new sense of place. She stated that she is not convinced that the flood plain is a problem, new research in urban forestry and other flood abatements is becoming more and more sophisticated, causing flood control issues to be much easier to address than in the past. She asked that future study be given to renovating Victory Stadium at a cost that will be acceptable to most taxpayers of the City of Roanoke.

Ms. Mark McConnel, 546 Camilla Avenue, S. E., addressed the issue of sustainability which involves building in such a way so as not to impact the environment in a way that is more detrimental than it needs to be; the Federal Government, including all branches of the Armed Forces, have mandates for sustainable design; and the number one thing that should not be done if a building is to remain sustainable, is to demolish an existing structure to create a new structure of similar purpose. He expressed concern with regard to the City of Roanoke and its ties to the natural environment; and the City's 2020 Comprehensive Plan, the Urban Forestry Plan, and the branding exercise all address Roanoke's tie to its natural environment. Therefore, he expressed concern that the City might be continuing on its current path which is most destructive to the environment – filling up a landfill with a renovatable structure, although the proposed stadium/amphitheater is a good idea. He expressed concern regarding the distance of seats from the stage in the proposed stadium/amphitheater. He discussed the funding mechanism and renovation of Victory Stadium using Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits; and advised that Victory Stadium was the first monument to victory in World War II; therefore, the facility is a State Historic Landmark and can be a National Historic Landmark, qualifying through corporate structuring for tax credits that could finance one-third of the renovation cost.

Mr. Mark Frye, 812 Wildwood Road, S. W., advised that he moved to Roanoke 17 years ago after having lived in numerous cities throughout the United States, and the Roanoke Valley is by far the best of all. He stated that Roanoke is a special place made up of special people and special attractions, a few of which are the Roanoke City Market, The Hotel Roanoke, Mill Mountain, the Mill Mountain Star and Victory Stadium. He added that Victory Stadium is special, he cannot imagine the facility being torn down because Victory Stadium belongs to the citizens of Roanoke and they should be allowed to decide its fate through a public referendum. From the standpoint of a parent of teenagers, he expressed concern about the traffic at the Orange Avenue site if a stadium/amphitheater is constructed at that location.

Mr. Don Bouldin, 2114 Berkley Avenue, S. W., referred to an existing cemetery in the area proposed for the new stadium/amphitheater complex on Orange Avenue and inquired as to who will pay for the cost of moving the cemetery. He stated that drawings show the proposed new stadium/amphitheater under steep steps which will create a hardship for elderly or disabled persons. He referred to comments regarding the deteriorating condition of Victory Stadium since nothing has been done to the facility for the past 60 years, and asked if a new stadium/amphitheater will suffer the same fate in 50 - 60 years. He inquired as to who will pay for demolishing Victory Stadium; and what will be the status of the agreement with Norfolk Southern if Victory Stadium is torn down. He spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium.

Ms. Evelyn D. Bethel, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., spoke in support of saving Victory Stadium. She encouraged all persons in attendance to attend the City Council meeting on Monday, August 4, 2003, to demonstrate their interest in the issue. She stated that many of the supporters of either stadium have already left the meeting, but it is hoped that the diminished crowd at this point does not diminish the outpouring that was expressed earlier in the evening.

Ms. Barbara Myler, 912 Stewart Avenue, S. E., spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium. She stated that Roanokers have fond memories of activities they have attended at Victory Stadium, and suggested that the City investigate whether Victory Stadium is eligible for historic tax credits that could be used to fund renovation.

Mr. E. Duane Howard, 508-B Walnut Avenue, S. W., advised that some Roanokers have been accused of living in the past, when others refuse to see the future of Victory Stadium. He stated that the future of sports is not in baseball, football, or even soccer, but in the gravity games, a venue alone that could support a renovated Victory Stadium. He added that some Roanokers are concerned about the past because the past was free of crime and violence, the word of the people was heard and not stifled, City Council followed the democratic rule and did not create its own rules, there were public servants who did not want to live off of the public, and a man's honesty was rewarded and not punished. He stated that Roanokers are proud of the past, they are proud of a past that will not allow historic names to be changed and buildings to be torn down, a past where Roanokers believed in freedom of the press. He further stated that Roanokers know they cannot live in the past, but they can capitalize on the past by renovating Victory Stadium; however, it appears that the City has chosen to ignore its future. He called attention to petitions signed

by over 7,000 persons in the Roanoke Valley in support of renovating Victory Stadium, and advised that if it is the will of the people to renovate Victory Stadium, the City has an obligation to support those wishes, right or wrong.

Mr. James St. Clair, 1322 Essex Avenue, N. W., expressed concern about the proposed location of the new stadium/amphitheater relative to traffic issues; and the stadium should be located outside of the City's corporate limits. He stated that there should have been more communication with citizens prior to the public forum and in the future Council should provide more opportunities for open dialogue with citizens on issues of concern to the community. He advised that Victory Stadium should be renovated in order to accommodate the recreational needs of the total community.

Mr. Larry Johnson, 6164 Burnham Road, S. W., Roanoke County, referred to other historical buildings in the City of Roanoke that have been demolished, such as the American Theater, Lee Junior High School, the Academy of Music, and the Hunter Memorial Viaduct. He called attention to renovation of the former Jefferson High School and The Hotel Roanoke, both of which are successful projects today, and stated that the City of Roanoke has done a good job in saving some of its historical sites; therefore, the same should be done for Victory Stadium because it is a historical landmark.

Mr. Sherman Lea, Sr., 1638 Lonna Drive, N. W., inquired if consideration has been given to the type of turf that will be used in the proposed new stadium, and requested a response at a later time. He addressed the issue of Roanoke's history of taking major public expenditures for public facilities to the citizens through a referendum. He conceded that there are instances in which cities, such as Roanoke, need not take bond issues to the voters, examples of which include situations where the City is fulfilling a contractual obligation, or when the City must meet a specific mandate, but when spending large sums of tax dollars on traditional public facilities, the City of Roanoke's history has been to take issues to the public through a referendum. He called attention to the Roanoke Civic Center bond issue which was not approved until the third try; there have been some comments that the only time past City Councils have gone to the public for a referendum was when a bond issue was tied to a tax increase; however, records in the City's Finance Department indicate that bond referendums held in 1987 for \$10 million, in 1990 for \$15.3 million and in 1997 for \$39 million were not tied to a tax increase; and since the last bond referendum in 1997, the City Council has authorized or issued over \$130 million in debt, which was authorized without a public referendum. He stated that a staggering number of citizens agree that a referendum is needed on the Victory Stadium issue.

Mr. Chris Craft, 1501 East Gate Avenue, N. E., spoke in support of allowing the citizens of Roanoke to decide on the fate of Victory Stadium through a public referendum. He addressed the condition of Victory Stadium and advised that past City Councils and past City administrations are to blame since no funds were appropriated by the City for needed repairs. He referred to the condition of East Gate Park and advised that in 1997, following the bond referendum, residents were promised basketball courts, tennis courts, etc., but no improvements have been made to date other than a small piece of playground equipment.

Ms. Harriet S. Lewis, 1015 Palmetto Street, N. W., representing Radio Station WTOY, shared some of the comments received from listeners; i.e., some question the wisdom of spending \$18 million when there are other needs in the City, particularly in the northwest community that have gone unaddressed; impact to the surrounding northwest community with the proposed placement of the new stadium at Williamson Road and Orange Avenue; the current process to receive citizen comment; a black cemetery near the proposed stadium which was disturbed when I-581 was built — how will contractors afford the cemetery the proper respect and how will stadium attendees and fans be warned and fined should they desecrate the cemetery; the proposed complex will be located in an area surrounded by residential neighborhoods, in addition to a high and constant volume of heavy traffic; the City of Roanoke prides itself on being a city of neighborhoods, therefore, why would the City reduce the quality of life for those citizens living within one block of this intrusive complex; and failure by the City to hold a public forum at the onset of the new stadium proposal may have been an unintended oversight, however, when any municipal body assumes an ongoing posture via its policies and procedures of restricting input, censoring legitimate discourse, and limiting comments and questions from its citizens regarding major issues, it is predictable that the same body will continue to ignore critically important facets of a process that are part and parcel of the democratic way of doing business.

Mr. Donald Dickerson, 4441 Oleva Street, N. W., spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium. He stated that it is the City's fault that the stadium has deteriorated because no funds were spent on renovation for approximately 60 years, and even though something is old does not mean that it is of no use. He inquired if a new stadium/amphitheater is constructed on the Orange Avenue site, will it too fall into a state of disrepair due to lack of maintenance by the City. He also inquired as to why all City facilities appear to be constructed on the north side of Roanoke.

Calvin H. Johnson, 3530 Windsor Road, S. W., Chair, Roanoke Civic Center Commission, advised that the Civic Center Commission supports the proposed new stadium/amphitheater, which represents the future for the City of Roanoke, the Roanoke Valley and southwestern Virginia. He stated that the proposed facility will provide Roanoke with the opportunity to hold events that it does not currently have the facilities to host; and the stadium/amphitheater is a new concept that will benefit not only the City of Roanoke, but other cities similar to Roanoke. He explained that the debt for the new facility will be addressed through revenues from events that are held at the facilities, along with other tax dollars. He asked that Council not rescind its previous action to construct a new stadium/amphitheater at the Oange Avenue site.

Mr. Randy Harrison, 2311 Westover Avenue, S. W., spoke in support of saving Victory Stadium and stated that Roanokers are fortunate to live in a city with a mountain and a river that runs through the heart of the City. He called attention to the many sporting activities that could be held at Victory Stadium and along the Roanoke River, such as canoeing and fishing, Maher Field, the tennis courts and the South Roanoke Sports complex. He expressed concern that public facilities are constructed in Roanoke, while infrastructure needs continue to suffer. He questioned whether costs associated with the new stadium/amphitheater have been accurately reported; and Roanoke should save Victory Stadium and actively market the facility in competition with the City of Salem.

Mr. Robert Gravely, 3360 Hersherberger Road, N. W., advised that he is not as concerned about the condition of Victory Stadium as the lack of marketing of the facility by the City. He stated that citizens do not support attractions at the Roanoke Civic Center because the average citizen cannot afford the price of a ticket; therefore, Victory Stadium should be renovated for future use. He advised that there is a need to create more jobs for Roanoke's citizens, City Council should represent the citizens of the City of Roanoke and not large business interests, Council must be accountable and responsible when spending taxpayers' money; and there should be more diversity in Roanoke City which can be achieved by marketing Roanoke to all races.

There being no further speakers, Mr. Landon expressed appreciation to all persons who participated in the meeting.

The Mayor expressed appreciation to Mr. Landon for serving as moderator over the proceedings and declared the meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

A P P R O V E D

ATTEST:

Mary F. Parker
City Clerk

Ralph K. Smith
Mayor
